

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. July 1905.

CONFIDENTIAL

(8472.)

N
8

FD 406

20

PART I.

CORRESPONDENCE

RESPECTING THE

AFFAIRS OF ARABIA.

January and February 1905.

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. July 1905.

CONFIDENTIAL.

(S472.)

PART I.

CORRESPONDENCE

RESPECTING THE

AFFAIRS OF ARABIA.

January and February 1905.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
1	Mr. Townley	990	Dec. 27, 1904	Disturbances in South Arabia. Transmits despatch from Acting Vice-Consul at Dhan-bekir respecting rumours of preparations in that vilayet for operations in connection with ..	1
2	" "	982	27,	Aden boundary. Conversation with Grand Vizier as to delay in issue of Iradee approving Sir N. O'Connor's proposals of August. Rumoured intention of appointing Abdullah Pasha Wali of Yemen (see No. 3).	1
3	" "	983	30,	Aden boundary (see No. 2). Transmits note from Porte embodying terms of Iradee in regard to (see No. 4) ..	2
4	India Office	"	Jan. 3, 1905	Aden delimitation. Transmits telegram to Viceroy embodying No. 3 and inquiring whether line from Muscat to Miral can now be settled ..	3
5	To Mr. Townley	4	4,	Alleged ambitious designs of Great Britain in Arabia. Conversation with Turkish Ambassador as to article in French newspaper respecting ..	2
6	" "	12	4,	Alleged British designs at Nejd, and movements of ships. Conversation with Turkish Ambassador ..	4
7	To Mr. de Bunsen	19	4,	Muscat Arbitration. United States' Government willing that Mr. Fuller should act as Arbitrator. Conversation with French Ambassador as to extension of time limit for meeting of Tribunal (see No. 11) ..	4
8	Mr. Choate	"	4,	Muscat Arbitration. Mr. Fuller willing to act as Arbitrator, but suggests delay in meeting of Tribunal ..	4
9	Mr. Townley	4 Tel.	6,	Aden delimitation (see No. 4). Thinks delimitation to Miral can now be concluded. Condition as to neither Power sending troops into nine cantons only difficulty. Suggests solution (see No. 15) ..	2
10	To India Office	"	6,	Aden Delimitation Commission. Services of officers should only be approved in measured terms ..	5
11	M. Cambon	"	6,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 7). Suggests that delay in assembling of Tribunal should be provided by postponing date for delivery of cases. Reminds as to choice of Umpire (see No. 21) ..	6
12	Mr. Townley	2 Confidential	2,	Nejd. Active policy decided on by Sultan. Expedition to be sent against Ibn Saud (see No. 14) ..	6
13	" "	3	3,	Disturbances in Yemen. Transmits despatch from Vice-Consul at Catmaran respecting (see No. 21) ..	7
14	" "	2	3,	Nejd. Projected expedition against Ibn Saud (see No. 15). Transmits despatch from Consul-General at Hagedah respecting (see No. 32) ..	8

[1516]

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

iii

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
15	Mr. Townley	11	Jan. 3, 1905	Aden delimitation (see No. 9). Conversation with Minister for Foreign Affairs respecting elimination of clause in Iradee prohibiting sending of troops into nine cantons ..	10
16	Admiralty	Confidential	6,	Erection of flagstaffs at Elphinstone Inlet, Telegraph Island, and Al Ghanam Island. Transmits correspondence from Commander-in-chief, East India Station ..	10
17	India Office	"	7,	Piracies in Persian Gulf. Transmits despatch from Indian Government, urging representations to Porte for arrest of Anand-iss-Seliman. Indian Government authorized to invoke aid of His Majesty's ships if necessary (see No. 35) ..	12
18	" "	"	7,	Proposed hoisting of flags near Cape Musandam. Correspondence respecting Admiralty objection. Transmits telegram to India, with instructions to suspend action ..	28
19	" "	"	9,	Aden delimitation (see No. 3). Transmits telegram from Resident, Aden ..	29
20	To Mr. Townley	3 Tel.	9,	Aden delimitation (see No. 3). Suggestion as to nine cantons inadmissible. To press for compliance with original demands, and recognition of north-east frontier (see Nos. 34 and 37) ..	30
21	To M. Cambon	"	11,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 11). Agrees to suggestion as to delay, and proposes exchange of notes. As regards Umpire, it will be sufficient if Arbitrators be asked to consent as to choice ..	20
22	To Mr. Townley	17	11,	Turkish complaints as to Captain Kunt's proceedings at Kuwait, and alleged landing of British officers at Busnrah. Conversation with Turkish Ambassador ..	21
23	India Office	"	11,	Muscat Arbitration. Transmits telegram to Viceroy respecting French proposal that list of flag-hoist lists should be included in Memorandum to be sent in by them to Tribunal ..	31
24	To Musurus Pasha	"	12,	Alleged British designs in Arabia. Denies newspaper allegations ..	32
25	To Sir F. Bertie	21 &	12,	Muscat Arbitration. Transmits copy of supplementary Agreement as signed (see No. 45) ..	22
26	India Office	"	12,	British protection for natives of Kuwait in Persia. Government of India advocates reconsideration of position taken up by His Majesty's Government. Requests views as to adoption of distinctive flags by Kuwait ships. Transmits correspondence (see Nos. 76 and 100) ..	32
27	" "	"	14,	Aden delimitation (see No. 3). Transmits telegram from Viceroy respecting Sultan's Iradee ..	32
28	Mr. Townley	14 Tel.	15,	Memrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 39). Not allowed by Turkish authorities to go to Nodjef. Requests instructions (see No. 41) ..	32
29	" "	16	16,	Reported despatch of troops to Yemen. Transmits despatch from Consul Richards respecting ..	33

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
30	Mr. Townley	22	Jan. 10, 1905	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 28). Permission refused for them to travel in Velayet of Bassorah. Has protested against unwarranted accusations of Wali ..	53
31	"	27	10,	Disturbances in Yemen (see No. 12). Transmits despatch from Camaran. Serious nature of risings (see No. 65) ..	55
32	"	28	10,	Nejd expedition (see No. 14). Transmits despatch from Bagdad respecting mobilization at Mezul ..	56
33	India Office	..	10,	Aden delimitation (see No. 9). Transmits telegram from Mr. Fitzmaurice, who believes Turkish Commission has received instructions (see No. 24) ..	57
34	"	..	16,	Aden delimitation (see No. 33). Transmits telegram to Viceroy informing of No. 10 ..	58
35	To Mr. Townley	24	17,	Pirates in Persian Gulf. Transmits No. 17. To secure to matter at an early date and ask for assurance suggested by Secretary of State for India (see No. 86) ..	58
36	Musurus Pasha	..	18,	Seizure of ship laden with contraband goods for Koweit by Bushire authorities. British Consul has protested. Requests that he may be informed that His Majesty's Government cannot protect inhabitants of Koweit (see No. 73) ..	59
37	To Mr. Townley	27	18,	Aden customs (see No. 20). Conversation with Turkish Ambassador. Turkish demand that British troops should never be sent into customs wholly unreasonable (see No. 77) ..	59
38	To India Office	..	18,	Alleged proceedings of British officers in Arabia. Transmits Nos. 6, 28, and 30. Asks what instructions were given to Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel. Not advisable that they should now travel in Arabia (see No. 43) ..	60
39	India Office	..	18,	Status of Zanzibar subjects in Muscat. Transmits correspondence from India ..	60
40	"	..	18,	Disorders at Bahrein. Transmits correspondence with Bushire respecting. His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" to remain at Bushire for the present ..	62
41	Mr. Townley	16 Tel.	19,	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 28). Journey to Nejd abandoned (see No. 42) ..	63
42	To Mr. Townley	6 Tel.	20,	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 41). Presumes journey to Nejd abandoned as well (see No. 48) ..	63
43	Mr. Townley	20 Tel.	21,	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 42). Had no intention of going to Nejd. In informing Turkish Government (see No. 46) ..	64
44	To Sir H. Howard	6	21,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 23). Transmits copy of Agreement for communication to International Bureau (see No. 62) ..	64
45	India Office	..	21,	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 35). Transmits despatch from India, and telegram to Viceroy saying that proceedings of party should be confined to coast. Thinks it unnecessary that restrictions should be imposed in regard to El Katr and territory of Trucial Chiefs (see No. 57) ..	64

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
46	Mr. Townley	23 Tel.	Jan. 23, 1905	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 43). Treated as prisoners at Hillah. Has protested to Porte, and requested facilities for Mr. Lorimer to visit Hama and Katif (see No. 43) ..	68
47	India Office	..	21,	Koweit and Nejd. Transmits telegram from Viceroy respecting approaching arrival of Ibn Saud in Koweit on his way to Safwan, where he is to meet Wali of Bassorah ..	69
48	To Mr. Townley	8 Tel.	24,	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 44). Visit to El Hama would be inopportune. To let matter drop, as concession, if Turkish Government refuse permission ..	69
49	To Chief Justice Foller	..	24,	Muscat Arbitration. Satisfaction of His Majesty's Government that he has consented to act as Arbitrator. Transmits copy of Agreement and supplementary Agreement (see No. 107) ..	70
50	Mr. Townley	25 Tel.	25,	Mr. Lorimer's journey (see No. 46). Turkish Government have no objection to his visiting Katif and internal, but request that he will not go to Hama ..	70
51	To Sir F. Bertie	32	25,	Muscat Arbitration. Has suggested to French Ambassador that four copies of Cases should be communicated to Permanent Bureau at The Hague, as Umpire has not yet been chosen (see No. 68) ..	70
52	To India Office	..	28,	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 45). Concurs in terms of telegram to Viceroy. Transmits Nos. 41, 42, 43, 46, 48, and 50 (see No. 60) ..	71
53	Mr. Townley	31	24,	Departure of troops ostensibly to Yemen. Recent events at Nejd. Transmits despatch from Damascus. Capture of Hail by Ibn Saud (see No. 55) ..	71
54	"	32	25,	Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel (see No. 46). Have returned to Bagdad. Conversation with Minister for Foreign Affairs and Grand Visier ..	72
54 ^a	"	33	24,	Condition of affairs in Nejd. Transmits Memoranda from Vice-Consul at Jeddah. Substance of letters from Ibn Saud to Grand Sherif and Wali of Hejaz ..	73
55	"	37	24,	Affairs in Nejd. Visit of Sir W. Willenka to Bagdad. Transmits diary from Consul-General at Bagdad ..	74
56	"	63	24,	Nejd. Proposed meeting of Ibn Saud's father, Wali of Bassorah, and Sheikh of Koweit. Sheikh has written to Wali respecting. Treatment of Sheikh's Agent at Basorah (see No. 72) ..	75
57	India Office	..	28,	Proposed Protectorate Treaty with Sheikh Ahmed of El Katr. Viceroy's proposals. India Office would prefer renewal of 1865 Agreement with Sheikh Mahomed (see No. 101) ..	76
58	Memorandum communicated by French Embassy	..	30,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 61). Ten copies of French Case already sent to The Hague, of which five are for His Majesty's Government. If His Majesty's Government have scruples as to following same procedure, date for handing in Cases might be postponed (see No. 59) ..	76

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
59	Memorandum for M. Cambon	..	Jan. 30, 1905	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 55). His Majesty's Government had not intended to suggest delay in exchange of Cases between two Governments. British Case will be forwarded to Paris for French Government (see No. 65)	77
60	India Office	..	30,	Mr. Lorimer's journey (see No. 52). Transmits telegram from Viceroy. Instructions sent that visit to El Hass is to be abandoned	77
61	Mr. Townley	27 Tel.	31,	Disturbances in Nejd. Expedition has left Nejd under Feizi Pasha (see No. 55) ..	78
62	To Sir H. Howard	7	31,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 44). Transmits supplementary Agreement for International Bureau (see No. 44)	78
63	"	8	31,	Muscat Arbitration. To notify International Bureau that arbitration has been decided on, and to inform them of names of Arbitrators (see No. 68)	78
64	"	9	31,	Muscat Arbitration. Transmits four copies of British Case for Bureau (see No. 70) ..	78
65	To Sir F. Bertie	61	31,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 59). Transmits copies of British Case for French Government (see No. 67)	79
66	Mr. Townley	28 Tel.	Feb. 1,	Yemen disturbances (see No. 31). Relief expedition reached Sanaa on 29th January (see No. 57)	79
67	Sir F. Bertie	32	1,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 65). British Case communicated to French Government ..	79
68	NIL				
69	Sir H. Howard	15	2,	Muscat Arbitration. Has carried out instructions contained in Nos. 52 and 63 ..	80
70	"	16	2,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 64). Transmits French Case. Has communicated British Case to Bureau	80
71	Mr. Townley	74 Confidential	Jan. 31,	Nejd. Telegram from Ibn Saud's father, renewing assurances of submission to Sultan	81
72	"	76	31,	Imprisonment of Sheikh of Kuwait's Agent at Busrah (see No. 56). His treatment now improved (see No. 93)	82
73	"	80	31,	Disturbances in Yemen. Transmits despatch from Huleidah respecting movements of troops. Question of arming native levies again raised (see No. 54)	82
74	India Office	..	Feb. 4,	Violation of Amiri boundary by Turks near Kataba. Conclusions arrived at by Government of India. Suggests that question of removal of Kefmakka be no further pressed, but that incident be used for obtaining understanding from Sultan (see No. 91) ..	83
75	M. Cambon	..	6,	Muscat Arbitration. Draws attention to title of British Case presented in name of His Majesty's Government and Sultan of Muscat. Cannot admit introduction of Sultan into the Arbitration (see No. 98)	85
76	Sir A. Hardinge	11 Tel.	6,	Koweit subjects in Persia (see No. 35). Inquires as to representations he should make to Persian Government	85

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
77	To Mr. Townley	41	Feb. 7, 1905	Aden delimitation (see No. 57). His Majesty's Government can no longer tolerate delay in settlement as to boundaries of nine cantons. To inform Porte as to views of His Majesty's Government. If any further difficulties are raised, latter will take their own measures for defining line and maintaining their rights	86
78	India Office	..	7,	Affray between Persians and Arabs at Bahrein. Transmits telegram from Viceroy advocating vigorous measures to coerce Sheikh. Proposals to approve suggestions, except as to occupation of Custom-house (see Nos. 94 and 95) ..	86
79	To Sir A. Hardinge	7 Tel.	9,	Koweit Arabs in Persia. Inform of No. 35. To endeavour to obtain same privileges for them as have been conceded in Afghanistan. Not advisable to claim them as British-protected persons	122
80	India Office	..	10,	Tour of Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel in neighbourhood of Persian Gulf. Transmits telegram from Viceroy. Allegations of Turkish Ambassador (see No. 34) are distortion of facts	123
81	Mr. Townley	32 Tel.	10,	Nejd. Ibn Saud's father endeavouring to obtain meeting with Veli with a view of offering his son's submission (see No. 85) ..	123
82	NIL				
83	Mr. Townley	34 Tel.	11,	Nejd (see No. 31). Meeting between Veli, Ibn Saud's father, and Sheikh of Kuwait on the 25th (see No. 96)	124
84	"	82	9,	Yemen disturbances (see No. 73). Transmits despatch from Aleppo. Twenty-four battalions called out for service ..	124
85	"	87	7,	Yemen disturbances (see No. 58). Transmits despatch from Damascus respecting military expedition	125
86	"	90	7,	Piracy in Persian Gulf (see No. 38). Transmits Memorandum presented to Minister of Interior urging that steps be taken for suppression of. Veli of Busrah instructed by telegram accordingly	125
87	"	95	7,	Yemen disturbances (see No. 66). News of relief of Banaa confirmed. Town will be in danger again if reinforcements do not arrive soon (see No. 103)	125
88	"	99	7,	Disturbances in Nejd (see No. 61). Reason to believe that large part of Feizi Pasha's force has deserted him	124
89	Law Officers	..	11,	Rights of tribes in pearl fisheries on Arabian coast of Persian Gulf. Reports as to (1) legal rights within and without 3-mile limit; (2) procedure to be followed in dealing with interlopers (see No. 115) ..	124
90	India Office	..	14,	Muscat Customs. Transmits telegram from Viceroy suggesting conditions on which arrangement might be proposed to Sultan for appointment of British Head Customs Officer, and guarantee by India of Customs revenue (see No. 99)	125

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
91	To Mr. Townley ..	45	Feb. 14, 1905	Violation of Amiri boundary. Transmits No. 74. Concurs in India Office view, but matter should be deferred till progress has been made towards settlement of main question of Aden frontier (see No. 117) ..	136
92	" ..	51	14,	Imprisonment at Basorah of Sheikh of Kuwait's Agent (see No. 73). To continue to press for his release ..	136
93	To India Office	14,	Muscat Arbitration. Introduction of Sultan's name into British Case. Transmits No. 75, and Memorandum by Attorney-General. Outlines proposed reply to French Ambassador (see No. 104) ..	136
94	India Office	15,	Proposed naval demonstration at Bahrain (see No. 76). Transmits telegram from Viceroy respecting movements of His Majesty's ships ..	137
95	To India Office	16,	Affray at Bahrain (see No. 78). Concurs in India Office view as to course to be adopted (see No. 98) ..	138
96*	Sir A. Hardinge ..	16 Tel.	17,	Kuwait Arabs in Persia. Refers to No. 79. Suggests informing Persian Government of Agreement of His Majesty's Government with Sheikh ..	138*
96	Mr. Townley ..	23 Tel.	17,	Nejd (see No. 82). Text of telegram from Consul at Basorah. Another meeting took place on 15th. First meeting led to no definite results (see No. 102) ..	138
97	Acting Consul Monahan to Mr. Townley ..	2	Jan. 28,	Fao incident, and "oude" of Sheikh at Fao. Transmits despatch addressed to Resident at Bushire respecting (see No. 113) ..	138
98	India Office	Feb. 16,	Disturbances at Bahrain (see No. 85). Transmits telegram to Viceroy in accordance with No. 78 ..	140
99	"	17,	Muscat Customs (see No. 80). Requests views of India Office as to Viceroy's suggestion ..	140
100	To India Office	18,	Adoption of distinctive flag for Kuwait vessels (see No. 87). Sir A. O'Connor sees no objection ..	141
101	"	18,	El Kutr (see No. 87). No advantage in reviving 1868 Agreement. Suggests that question of new Agreement be deferred till general Persian Gulf policy has been examined by Imperial Defence Committee ..	141
102	Mr. Townley ..	111 Confidential	14,	Nejd (see No. 86). Has not yet ascertained details of second meeting beyond fact that Abdur Rahman made submission to Sultan in his own name and that of his son Abdul Aziz. Military expedition under Feizi Pasha making little progress ..	142
103	" ..	112 Confidential	14,	Yemen disturbances (see No. 83). News not reassuring ..	142
104	India Office	18,	Muscat Arbitration (see No. 80). Transmits telegram to Viceroy asking if he concurs in proposed reply to M. Cambon. Draws attention to previous correspondence with Sultan of Muscat ..	143
105	Question asked in the House of Commons (Mr. Weir)	22,	Protection of Egyptian pilgrims to Mecca ..	144

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
105	To Mr. Townley ..	59	Feb. 23, 1905	Bahrain. Protest of Turkish Ambassador against action of British officers. His Excellency informed that island is under British protection, and His Majesty's Government had right to obtain redress for outrages committed there ..	144
107	Sir M. Darnley ..	54	18,	Muscat Arbitration. Transmits letter from Chief Justice Fuller acknowledging No. 49 ..	145
106	Mr. Townley ..	42 Tel.	23,	Movements of troops and stores in nine cantons. Turkish Government anxious as to. Requests instructions in event of his being questioned (see No. 114) ..	145
108	India Office	22,	Position of Political Agent at Kuwait. Transmits letter from Government of India, who consider withdrawal of Agent undesirable, but suggest steps for temporary withdrawal ..	146
109	Mr. Townley ..	43 Tel.	24,	Nejd (see No. 86). Transmits telegram from Basorah. Report of first meeting corroborated. Further details of second meeting ..	146
111	To Sir A. Hardinge ..	17 Tel.	24,	Kuwait Arabs in Persia. To inform Persian Government that His Majesty's Government have special arrangements with Sheikh, and that they consider he enjoys large measure of practical independence ..	148
112	Acting Consul Monahan to Mr. Townley ..	4	4,	"Sudd" at Fao. Transmits despatch to Resident at Bushire modifying that included in No. 97 ..	148
113	Mr. Townley ..	44 Tel.	25,	Yemen disturbances (see No. 103). Further bad news ..	149
114	To Mr. Townley ..	15 Tel.	25,	Alleged movements of troops in nine cantons (see No. 108). His Majesty's Government have no knowledge. To reply, if questioned, that His Majesty's Government reserve right of taking measures to maintain their claims ..	149
115	To India Office	25,	Pearl fisheries in Persian Gulf. Transmits Law Officers' Report (No. 59) for observations ..	149
116	Mr. Townley ..	123	26,	Yemen disturbances. Transmits despatch from Damascus respecting expedition ..	149
117	" ..	124	31,	Movements of troops at Nejd. Transmits despatch from Bagdad respecting ..	150
118	" ..	127	31,	Violation of Amiri boundary (see No. 91). Conversation with Grand Vizier. Report from Minister of Tax not yet received. Yemen disturbances. Unsatisfactory state of affairs ..	151
119	Sir H. Howard ..	30	27,	Muscat Arbitration. View of M. Lehman that choice of Umpire must now be entrusted to King of Italy (see No. 120) ..	152
120	" ..	31 Confidential	27,	Muscat Arbitration. Inform of correspondence between M. Lehman and Mr. Fuller as to selection of Umpire, and failure to arrive at agreement ..	153
121	India Office	28,	Turkish accusations against British officers in Persian Gulf. Transmits telegram from Viceroy refuting, and suggesting that steps be taken at Constantinople protesting against readiness with which baseless accusations are accepted ..	153

ERRATA.

Page 8, No. 14, line 1. For "despatch No. 5," read "despatch No. 2."
 Page 55, No. 31, line 1. For "despatch No. 7," read "despatch No. 6."
 Page 71, No. 53, line 1. For "despatch No. 18," read "despatch No. 16."

CONFIDENTIAL

Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Arabia.

PART I.

No. 1.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 2, 1905.)

(No. 980.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, December 27, 1904.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 969 of the 20th instant, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Acting Vice-Consul at Diarbekir, reporting rumoured preparations in the vilayet for military operations in Southern Arabia.

I have, &c.

(Signed)

WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 1.

Acting Vice-Consul Young to Mr. Townley.

(No. 99.)

Sir,

Diarbekir, December 15, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to report that there has been considerable stir in the higher official circles of this vilayet during the past week owing to peremptory orders which it would seem have been received from Constantinople to raise a sum of £T. 15,000 and to provide some 6,000 camels immediately for purposes of transport.

There is also a persistent rumour that Ibrahim Pasha has received secret orders to hold his command, viz., three regiments of Hamidiéh, in readiness for service in Southern Arabia.

These circumstances are not generally known in the vilayet, but the impression is wide-spread that preparation is being made on a large scale for operations in connection with recent disturbances among the Southern Arab tribes.

I have, &c.

(Signed)

H. WILKIE YOUNG.

No. 2.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 2, 1905.)

(No. 992.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, December 27, 1904.

I REMINDED the Grand Vizier yesterday that he had told me on the 19th instant that the Aden boundary question was to be submitted the following day to a Special Council of Ministers sitting at Yildiz Palace, that their deliberations would certainly result in a new "Mashatta," advising the Sultan to approve of the proposals

[1516]

B

made by Sir Nicholas O'Connor in August last, which had been already accepted by the Iradé that made such a meteoric appearance at the Porte in the early days of October, and that the matter would be settled in a day or two.

A week, I said, had now elapsed, and I could only conclude, since no Iradé had appeared, that either the Council had not decided in the sense he had indicated, or that His Majesty was not willing to accept their advice. Such being the case, it only remained for me to inform your Lordship that a settlement of the question seemed as remote as ever, in spite of the assurances which had been conveyed to you by Musurus Pasha that it would be settled immediately.

The Grand Vizier assured me that the Special Council had advised the Sultan to ratify the arrangement come to with Sir N. O'Connor, and begged me to be patient for one day more. I consented, but said that I could not conceive that your Lordship would be willing to wait much longer before taking the steps, as reported by Musurus Pasha, which would have humiliating results for Turkey.

Mr. Lamb ascertained at the Porte this afternoon that, after my departure yesterday, the Grand Vizier sent an urgent letter to the Palace, asking why the Iradé had not been issued. To his query answer was made that the decision given by the Extraordinary Council must now be submitted to the ordinary Council, which meets to-morrow. Mr. Lamb was promised that the Iradé would appear on Thursday or Friday at latest.

It is now rumoured that Abdullah Pasha, late Acting Vali and Commander-in-Chief of the Yemen, is to be appointed Vali of that province. As it has been openly stated and acknowledged at the Porte that he is responsible for the delay that has occurred in the settlement of the Aden question, I deemed it advisable to instruct Mr. Lamb to warn the Minister for Foreign Affairs that such an appointment, coupled with the Porte's repeated breach of promises and procrastination in settling the Aden Delimitation Agreement, would make the worst possible impression.

Tawfik Pasha professed to be ignorant of any intention to send Abdullah Pasha back to the Yemen, but asked if such an appointment would meet with the opposition of His Majesty's Government if the Aden question was first settled.

Mr. Lamb replied that, as far as he was aware, it would not.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

No. 3.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 2, 1905.)

(No. 987.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, December 30, 1904.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 195 of to-day's date, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith copy of a communication from the Sublime Porte embodying the terms of the Imperial Iradé in regard to the Aden frontier delimitation.

I have, &c.

(In the absence of the Chargé d'Affaires).

(Signed) J. C. T. VAUGHAN.

Inclosure in No. 3.

Note communicated by the Ottoman Government to Mr. Townley.

EN réponse à la communication et au *pro-mémoré* de l'Ambassade de Sa Majesté Britannique en date des 16 Août et 15 Septembre derniers, le Ministère des Affaires Étrangères a l'honneur de l'informer qu'en vue d'écarter tout motif de malentendu et de maintenir le *statu quo* dans les neuf cantons où aucun des deux Gouvernements ne pourra envoyer des troupes, le Gouvernement Impérial a donné à ses Commissaires les instructions nécessaires pour que la délimitation du Canton de Sabahi se fasse par une ligne allant à Kuddam ou dehors de Bab-el-Mendeb, sur le littoral de la Mer d'Aden,

à la condition que le village de Turba, les puits, ainsi que le territoire bordé par une ligne aboutissant à Scheikh Mirat, restent dans le Vilayet du Yémen.

En ce qui concerne l'allusion faite à une cession de territoire à une tierce Puissance quelconque, il y a lieu d'ajouter que le Gouvernement Impérial n'a jamais eu, et ne saurait avoir, pareille intention.

Le 29 Décembre, 1904.

No. 4.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 4.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 2nd January, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, January 3, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 4.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, January 2, 1905.

NOTE has been received from Turkish Ambassador regarding Aden delimitation, substance of which is that, with a view to maintenance of the *status quo* in the Nine Cantons, to which no troops are to be sent either by the British or the Turkish Governments, the Turkish Commissioners have been instructed to proceed with delimitation of Sabahi border, by a line running from Kuddam outside Bab-el-Mendeb to the sea of Aden littoral, on condition that village and wells of Turba, and territory bordered by a line terminating at Sheikh Mirat, shall remain in the Vilayet of Yemen. No mention is made in note of delimitation of boundary north-east to the desert, but promise is given that territory will not be ceded to a third Power. I should be glad to know whether instructions sent by the Turkish Government to their Commissioners will enable settlement of line from Madariba to Mirat to be effected. Please instruct Fitzmaurice to report on this point.

Repeated to Aden.

No. 5.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 6.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 4, 1905.

THE Turkish Ambassador made to me to-day a statement to the following effect:—

A telegram sent by his Excellency to the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, relative to extracts published by the "Times" from an article in the "Petit Parisien" in regard to alleged ambitious designs of Great Britain in Arabia, had been submitted to the Sultan.

In view of the ancient friendship between Great Britain and Turkey, the publication of these statements without any "démenti" had painfully affected His Imperial Majesty. Such publications were clearly made with the object of impairing the sincere and friendly relations existing between the two countries.

It was hoped that a communication would be made to the "Times" which would dispose of these assertions, and his Excellency had been requested to approach me on the subject.

I told his Excellency that I had not seen the correspondence to which he referred, and I asked him whether he had brought a copy with him. He said that he had not done so. I replied that if he would supply me with a copy of the letter I would consider his request, but that as at present advised I saw no reason for which His

Majesty's Government was called upon to take part in the discussion. It was not our custom to do so, and if we once began such a practice we should never be able to stop.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 6.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 12.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 4, 1905.

THE Turkish Ambassador made to me to-day a statement to the following effect:—

The Turkish Government were informed that besides the "Lawrence" and "Sphinx" now at Bussorah, four other British gun-boats had arrived in the roadstead of Zohair, two hours distance from Bussorah, and that the officials on board had erected tents outside the town, leaving for Bagdad after an interval. Their names were stated by the Vali of Bussorah to be Mr. Linsyn, a civil official in the Punjab; Captain Gabriel, of the Indian cavalry; and Kiasir, British Agent at Bahrein. They were believed to have the intention of proceeding to Nejd, with the object of persuading Ibn Saud to rise in rebellion against the Imperial Government and accept British protection.

Musurus Pasha was instructed to call attention to these incidents, in the hope that an end might be put to a state of affairs which was not consistent with the cordial and friendly relations existing between the two countries.

I said that I had not heard of the alleged movement of British ships, but that the report that His Majesty's Government contemplated the establishment of a British Protectorate in the interior of Arabia was ridiculous, and I could not suppose that anyone would suspect us of such designs.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 7.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. de Bunsen.

(No. 13.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 6, 1905.

I TOLD the French Ambassador to-day that the American Government had placed at our disposal the services of Chief Justice Fuller to act as Arbitrator in the Muscat Case, but that he could not at present be certain whether his public engagements in the United States would allow of his presence at The Hague within the strict time fixed by the agreement between the two Governments for the meeting of the Tribunal—viz., the 27th May. Mr. Fuller suggested that perhaps the time limit of one fortnight, within which the Tribunal are to assemble after the delivery of the Arguments, might be extended to one month, in which case he could count upon reaching The Hague without undue haste. I asked his Excellency to be good enough to ascertain whether the French Government had any objection to this proposal. It would not of course involve any delay in the exchange of Cases, Counter-Cases, and Arguments, the delivery of which would still be governed by the terms of the Agreement of the 13th October.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 8.

Mr. Choate to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 5.)

My Lord,

American Embassy, London, January 4, 1905.

REFERRING to your Lordship's note of the 29th December, asking me to ascertain whether my Government would agree to the selection of Mr. Chief Justice Fuller to act as Arbitrator named by His Majesty under the Agreement between His

Majesty's Government and that of the French Republic for referring to arbitration certain matters in dispute between them in regard to Muscat which are specified in the Preamble to the Agreement, I have the honour to report that the Chief Justice consents, with my Government's approval, to serve as one of the Arbitrators under the said Treaty between Great Britain and France of the 13th October, 1903.

I am instructed to say that he greatly appreciates the honour, but hopes that it may be arranged in advance that the meeting of the Tribunal shall not take place earlier than one month after the delivery of the Arguments. The time specified in the Agreement is within a fortnight, and I suppose that the Chief Justice's request is made with a view to his peremptory engagements in the Supreme Court, which usually continue till the middle of May. Six months for the delivery of the Cases and Counter-Cases would bring it to the 13th April, one month more for delivery of Arguments, to the 13th May, and it might not be convenient for him, without undue haste, to reach The Hague by the 27th May.

I should have advised your Lordship of the Chief Justice's acceptance in my private note of the 26th December, but for a blunder in the transmission to me of the cable from Washington announcing it.

I have, &c.
(Signed) JOSEPH H. CHOATE.

No. 9.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 6.)

(No. 4.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, January 6, 1905.

DELIMITATION of Aden frontier.

See my despatch No. 987 of the 30th ultimo. Inclosure in this despatch reads "A Kuddan": it is a copy of a communication made to me by the Sublime Porte. I do not think it possible that any confusion with Jebel Kawahi could have arisen. In my opinion, the delimitation to Mirad could, on the strength of the Irade, be satisfactorily concluded by the Commissioners on the spot.

The condition as to neither Power sending troops into the Nine Cantons seems to me to be the only stumbling-block, and of this difficulty I venture to submit the following solution, viz., that an answer should be addressed to the Sublime Porte taking act of their having accepted the line proposed in our Memorandum, and pointing out that while the delimitation had for its object the maintenance of the *status quo*, His Majesty's Government reserve their right to send troops into the districts mentioned as heretofore as occasion may require their presence there.

No. 10.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sr,

Foreign Office, January 6, 1905.

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 16th ultimo, inclosing the Report by General Maitland on the work of the Aden Delimitation Commission, together with a covering despatch from the Government of India.

With reference to Mr. Secretary Brodrick's observations respecting the services of the officers employed in the delimitation, I am to say that, in Lord Lansdowne's opinion, any approval by His Majesty's Government of the conduct of these officers should be expressed in very measured terms.

It is true that the task intrusted to them was difficult and complicated, and, inasmuch as that task has actually been accomplished, the Members of the Commission are entitled to the thanks of His Majesty's Government.

Lord Lansdowne considers, however, that the time taken to complete the work of delimitation was unduly prolonged; that the delays were not by any means entirely due to Turkish obstruction or the inherent difficulties of the task; and that the lack of harmony and frank co-operation between the Resident and the Commission which manifested itself on frequent occasions, was most unfortunate.

[1516]

C

It would be invidious now to go into these matters, or to endeavour to apportion responsibility for these shortcomings, but Lord Lansdowne does not think that the case is one in which, upon the whole, any warm commendation on the part of His Majesty's Government is deserved by those concerned.

I am, &c.
(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 11.

M. Cambon to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 7.)

M. le Marquis, *Ambassade de France, Londres, le 6 Janvier, 1905.*
MON Gouvernement, auquel j'avais fait part des indications que votre Seigneurie a bien voulu me donner dans notre récent entretien au sujet du choix du Représentant pour l'Angleterre dans l'arbitrage des boudes Mascatais, me fait savoir qu'il est tout disposé à consentir à une prolongation de certains délais de façon à donner à M. Melville W. Fuller le temps voulu pour arriver à La Haye, ainsi que le désire votre Seigneurie. Mais il y a lieu d'observer que le Compromis du 13 Octobre n'a pas prévu la faculté de prolonger le délai de quinze jours qui doit s'écouler entre la remise des Mémoires et la réunion du Tribunal, tandis qu'au contraire l'Article 2 du paragraphe 4 a stipulé qu'on pourrait d'un commun accord prolonger le délai pour la remise des Mémoires. Dans ces conditions, M. Delcassé pense qu'il serait préférable de reculer de quinze jours la date même de la remise des Mémoires qui marque le commencement de toute la procédure, et il me charge de proposer à votre Seigneurie de la reporter du 13 Janvier au 1^{er} Février.

Je serais reconnaissant à votre Seigneurie de vouloir bien me dire si elle approuve cette proposition. Il y a lieu également de ne pas oublier que les Arbitres auront encore au préalable à s'entendre pour le choix du Surarbitre.

Veuillez, &c.
(Signé) PAUL CAMBON.

No. 12.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 9.)

(No. 2. Confidential.)

My Lord, *Constantinople, January 2, 1905.*
WITH reference to my telegram No. 1 of to-day's date, informing your Lordship that His Majesty's Acting Consul at Bussorah has telegraphed that a battalion of troops from that place have been dispatched to Nejd via Bagdad, I have the honour to state that this report from Mr. Monahan confirms the latest information that has reached me on this subject.

I am assured on very good authority that, after long deliberations at the Palace, the Sultan has finally decided upon an active policy in the Nejd direction, and has ordered that a new and more powerful expedition shall be prepared without loss of time, for the ostensible purpose of assisting Ibn Rashid to crush Ibn Saoud and his Wahabi followers.

The ulterior intention is that the expedition shall, when it has achieved its object, permanently occupy all the principal places, both on the coast and in the interior of the peninsula, after removing all the local Chiefs to Constantinople.

That the expedition is to be conducted on a large scale is shown by the fact that Ibrahim Pasha, of the Milli, has been ordered by telegraph to collect and forward to Bagdad 6,000 camels to serve for the transport of the stores and ammunition.

Mr. Monahan has also informed me by telegram, dated the 29th December, 1904, that the Acting Vali of Bussorah invited Ibn Saoud to that place in a friendly letter some two months ago, and that, about a month ago, Ibn Saoud's father sent a telegram to the Sultan (possibly the communication contained in my despatch No. 832, Secret, of the 8th November, 1904) professing loyalty, but claiming ownership of Kassim, and deprecating the dispatch of troops, which would cause bloodshed.

Mr. Monahan adds that the semi-independent Kafmakam of Katr also sent a telegram in the same sense to the Sultan about the same time, in which he said that

the people of Katr were hostile to Ibn Rashid, and that, if Turkish troops were sent, the country would become like Koweit.

The Mutessarif of Hassa, Faik Pasha, was dismissed, Mr. Monahan reports, some five or six weeks ago, on the score, it is said, that he was sending provisions to Ibn Saoud. It is announced that Nedjib Bey, an ex-Mutessarif of El Bassan, has been appointed to replace him.

I have very good reason to believe that it was fully intended, up to a very few days ago, to accept the submission which Ibn Saoud had made by telegram addressed direct to the Sultan, and that instructions were sent to Bagdad and Bussorah to the effect that his submission had been accepted, and that the preparations for the military expedition against him were to be discontinued. I do not know what has caused the Sultan to suddenly change his mind, and it would be no matter for surprise should His Majesty again listen to wiser counsels. Well-informed military circles are fully alive to the magnitude of the task to be undertaken, and are well aware of the difficulties to be overcome in dispatching and maintaining a large military force in the inhospitable regions from which the victorious Egyptian expedition had to depart in 1819.

The Turkish Government have, moreover, a formidable undertaking before them in the suppression of the revolt in the Yemen, which would appear, from all accounts, to be assuming such alarming proportions that it will tax all their available resources to cope with it.

A rumour is current here that Sana'a has fallen into the hands of the rebels, but I have no confirmation of such an event from His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Hodeida, though, as I have had the honour to inform your Lordship in a previous despatch, the capital of the province has for some weeks been cut off from communication with the coast.

I have, since writing the above, received further information, which confirms the report that the Ottoman Government have decided to send an expedition against Ibn Saoud. My informant tells me that it has been represented to the Sultan by the Amir of Mecca that the aggressions of Ibn Saoud are due solely to foreign instigation, and that, unless they are promptly checked, the Wahabi encroachments may even extend as far as Mecca. It is reported that Marshal Feizi Pasha has been put at the head of the expedition which is to start from Bagdad shortly, if it has not already done so. It is, perhaps, worth noting that in all the communications which reach me about Ibn Saoud, the name of Mubarak-ee-Sabah, Sheikh of Koweit, is always associated with that of the Wahabi Chief.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

No. 13.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 9.)

(No. 5.)

My Lord, *Constantinople, January 3, 1905.*
WITH reference to my telegram No. 196, of the 30th December, 1904, on the subject of the disturbed state of the Yemen Vilayet, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Jeddah, transmitting a despatch from His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Camaran on the same subject.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure 1 in No. 13.

Consul Devey to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 117.)

Sir, *Jeddah, December 15, 1904.*
I HAVE the honour to forward, in duplicate, copy of a despatch, No. 103, received this day from Vice-Consul Richardson, which confirms various rumours that have been obtaining here for about a month past.

I have, &c.
(Signed) G. P. DEVEY.

Inclosure 2 in No. 13.

Vice-Consul Richardson to Consul Derry

(No. 103)

Sir,

Camran, December 8, 1904

FOR the past six weeks, or, more correctly, since the departure of Abdulla Pasha from Saada about the close of October last, a part of this province has been in a rather disturbed condition.

The area affected has been chiefly in the hilly country between Suk-el-Khanna and Menakla, where the tribesmen have always been hostile to the Turks.

In an encounter early in November the Turkish troops, who had been moved from the capital to quell the revolt, lost one officer and about a dozen men, after severely punishing the rebel Arabs.

The telegraph line has been cut in several places between the above-mentioned towns, and cut out on between Hodeida and Saada interrupted for some time.

The weekly post also arrives, and is dispatched with great irregularity, and requires a strong escort.

There have been other outbreaks at Haje and its vicinity, where adherents of the new Imam are very active.

The Vah telegraphed to Constantinople for more troops, and I learn that the Imperial authorities, in reply, have informed his Excellency that six transports are being sent and will soon be dispatched with reinforcements.

The perennial trouble given by Zerrneck tribesmen was again in evidence during the past month. Recently they demanded the release of one of their Sheikhs who was suffering imprisonment at Hodeida, threatening to cut the telegraph wires in their territory if their request were not acceded to.

It is needless to add that the authorities, who have invariably displayed great weakness hitherto in dealing with the above tribe, complied almost immediately.

Famine is still raging throughout the whole of the Yemen, and the sufferings of the people are inexpressible.

I have &c.
(Signed) G. A. RICHARDSON

No. 14

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne (Received January 9)

(No. 9)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 3, 1905

WITH reference to my despatch No. 9 of yesterday's date on the subject of the state of affairs in Atyd, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul General at Bagdad, reporting further respecting the projected expedition against Ibn Saoud.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY

Inclosure 1 in No. 14

Consul-General Newmarch to Mr. Townley

(No. 72)

Sir,

Bagdad, November 28, 1904

IN continuation of my despatch No. 72, dated the 12th instant, I have the honour to submit, for your information, the enclosed extract from my diary to the Government of India regarding the projected expedition against Ibn Saoud.

I have, &c.
(Signed) L. B. NEWMARCH, Major

Inclosure 2 in No. 14.

Extract from Diary to Government of India for week ending November 28, 1904

THE Vice-Consul at Kerbala reports as follows about the recent expedition against Ibn Saoud —

A belief has long been entertained here by the public that the four regiments of Ibn Rashid had been entirely annihilated, and that he had sustained a serious defeat. This belief has lately been confirmed by the report of two privates who escaped from their regiment at Jabal, and arrived here about ten days ago.

They say that their force experienced great hardships and hunger while en route to Jabal, and that a few days after their arrival the Amir (Ibn Rashid) ordered an attack on the town.

The Amir placed the Turkish troops and their officers in front, and his own men followed. The combined forces then entered Ibn Saoud's territory, and, without much resistance, captured the towns, compelling Ibn Saoud and his followers to flee.

After that, Ibn Rashid received a letter from one Ibn Barsam in Basra, telling him that he had contrived certain plans for the delivery of the place into his hands, and asking him to go there with his forces as soon as possible.

The Amir was deceived, and started for Basra, where he was surprised and attacked by Ibn Saoud.

The Amir and his men, who were in the rear, escaped, with about 300 officers and men, because they knew the roads, but the others remained fighting and were either killed or captured.

All reports combine in giving an exceedingly pathetic account of the Turks in Ibn Rashid's hands at Jabal; they are said to be severely treated and scantily maintained.

Two officers—a Major and a Colonel—were killed by the Amir in Jabal because they refused to obey the Amir's orders, and make a second invasion after their defeat. The officers here are much incensed against the Amir, but dare not express their feelings.

The Amir has reported the occurrence to Constantinople, and fresh troops have been ordered to support him.

The new expedition will consist of four regiments of infantry, twelve to sixteen guns with men and officers forming one regiment, perhaps one regiment of mule riders. These six regiments will be raised from Bagdad, Amara, Kerbala, Hillah, and Kirkook, and Faiz Pasha, the late acting W. H. of Bagdad, will be in command.

The Government has sanctioned £T. 5,000 for the necessary expenses, but the late W. H. has demanded £T. 30,000.

The reserves which have been mobilized are for the purpose of replacing the

late Pasha and these troops are to meet at Najaf, and then follow the route taken by pilgrims to Jabal and Mecca; the transport will be by means of camels, which will be supplied by the Amir.

Besides these troops it is said that 10,000 men will be sent from Hilla, both to meet at Jabal.

It is said that Faiz Pasha is very unwilling to go, and has tried to get off this unexpected call to duty, but has failed to do so. He then asked to be allowed to proceed to Damascus with his troops, and from there, taking six more regiments, proceed to Jabal; this also has been refused.

Faiz Pasha is said to have appointed one Fadh, son of Abdul Mihan, formerly official sheikh of the Anazir tribe, to accompany him, but, on the request of the Amir, who is on bad terms with Faiz, he was dismissed, and another man has been appointed.

Ibn Fadh is said to be a friend of Ibn Saoud, and he was reappointed to the Chieftainship of the Anazir tribe in order to win him over; what exactly was the object is not known.

Turkish officials, and many others, are looking on these disturbances with interest, and that the English are at the bottom of it all.

No. 15

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne—(Received January 9.)

(No. 11.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 3, 1904

I SPOKE to the Minister for Foreign Affairs yesterday, about the Aden frontier question, and said that it was a great pity that what would have otherwise been a victory had been marred by the insertion of such an ill-considered and undesirable condition as that which said that neither Power should send troops into the nine cantons. I represented that some of these cantons were far removed from the Province of the Yemen, and were in immediate proximity to Aden itself, and that the Turkish Government could hardly seriously anticipate that Great Britain would relinquish such a right over territory which had been under British sovereignty since 1847.

The Minister replied that he did not know how the clause had got inserted, but that, of course, no one could prevent Great Britain sending troops into the nine cantons if she felt so disposed.

I concurred, but pointed out that the matter could not be settled satisfactorily until the Porte had withdrawn a condition which was obnoxious in form however inoperative it might of necessity remain in practice.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY

No. 16.

Admiralty to Foreign Office (Received January 9.)

(Confidential.)

Sir,

Admiralty, January 6, 1904

WITH reference to previous correspondence, I am commanded by my Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to transmit herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, a copy of correspondence from the Commander of the East India Station, relative to the erection of flag-staffs at Elphinstone Inlet, Telegraph Island, and Al Ghannam Island, in accordance with the Indian Government.

I am, &c.
(Signed) C. I. THOMAS

Inclosure 1 in No. 16.

Atkinson-Willes to Admiralty.

January 7, 1904

WITH reference to paragraph 7 of Commander Kemp's letter, the Government of India do not wish the Sultan of Muscat to have any dealings with those flag-staffs which are not on territory over which he exercises rights, to prevent him being in an awkward position with other Powers with whom he has diplomatic relations.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE L. ATKINSON-WILLES,
Rear Admiral, Commander-in-chief

Inclosure 2 in No. 16.

Commander Kemp to Rear Admiral Atkinson-Willes

(Confidential.)

Sir,

"Sphinx," at Sea, lat. 22° 51' N.,
long 66° 51' E., November 1903.

I HAVE the honour to report that on the 18th instant I received a request from His Majesty's Consul at Muscat to erect the flag-staffs at Mussenden, in accordance with the wishes of the Indian Government. He also asked me to convey Lieutenant Shakespear to Bander Abbas to take over his political duties there, and to Mussenden to be present when the flag-staffs were put up. Major Grey explained

1.

that as the Government of India had decided that no reference was to be made to the Sultan of Muscat, that he (Major Grey) had represented to the Government of India that it would be better that he should have nothing to do with the matter, and that his place should be taken by Lieutenant Shakespear, within whose political sphere it would lie. In this the Government of India assented.

I accordingly left the same day, landed Lieutenant Shakespear at Bander Abbas on the 20th, and embarking him again, arrived at Elphinstone Inlet next morning.

3. The flag-staffs were erected at Elphinstone Inlet, Telegraph Island, and Al Ghannam Island.

For convenience of reference I propose to call them flag-staffs A, B, C, in the above order. Flag-staff A is erected at the eastern end of the isthmus, between Khor-ash-Shen (Elphinstone Inlet) and Kubbah Ghazira (Malcolm Inlet). It is situated on a ridge about 20 feet high overlooking both inlets. Further to the west along the isthmus the cliffs are high and precipitous, and in our opinion the site chosen was the best possible, as it is comparatively easy of access. Flag-staff B is on Telegraph Island close to the pier of the old telegraph buildings. Flag-staff C is in a grove some few hundred yards north of the south-east corner of Ghannam Island. It is quite screened from view from outside. Anywhere on the hill it could be visible from seaward, and this also applies to the sandy beach under Pier Point. A and B

4. All the flag-staffs were red-tinted, freshly painted white, and fitted with cross-

5. On the way back we visited the Sultan of Muscat's Vah at Khorash and the Headman of Kumbur Village, but owing to the decision of the Government of India, referred to in paragraph 1, we did not consider it proper to make any reference to the flag-staffs. I do not think there is much danger of their being interfered with, but it would be well if definite arrangements could be made as soon as possible.

6. I would suggest that if possible the Vah of Khasab should be put in charge of all three, but if we employ our own agents it would be convenient if the guardians of A and B resided at Khasab, and of C at Kumbur.

7. Lieutenant Shakespear disembarked at Bander Abbas 2nd instant, and I arrived at Muscat the next day.

8. I would respectfully suggest, as Elphinstone Inlet is a fine harbour, that a sketch survey should be made of the place on a sufficiently large scale. "Sphinx" and "Redoubt" could do this when opportunity offered. Bander Abbas is convenient for mails, and Henjam for telegrams.

I have, &c.
(Signed) T. W. KEMP, Commander and Senior
Naval Officer, Persian Gulf Division

Inclosure 3 in No. 16.

Rear Admiral Atkinson-Willes to Government of India

(Confidential.)

Sir,

"Hyanth," at Sea, lat. 14° 57' E.,
long 84° 43' E., December 7, 1904.

IN continuance of my letter of the 24th October last, relative to the erection of flag-staffs in the Persian Gulf, he pleased to lay before his Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council the annexed letter from Commander T. W. Kemp, of His Majesty's ship "Sphinx," Senior Naval Officer in the Persian Gulf, of the 25th ultimo, reporting having erected the flag-staffs at Elphinstone Inlet, Telegraph Island, and Sheep Island.

2. Elphinstone Inlet is a fine harbour, but too confined and narrows for a white man. A further survey of it is not necessary.

Khor Kawi is nearer the entrance to the Gulf than Elphinstone Inlet, and is more suitable for naval purposes, besides being cooler and having excellent anchorage for large ships.

4. The temperature of the water at Khor Kawi in July is two degrees cooler than at Basidhu; it is, therefore, less oppressive, and about on a par with Aden.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE L. ATKINSON-WILLES,
Rear-Admiral, Commander-in-chief.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 9.)

Sir,
 WITH reference to Mr. Vickers' letter of the 29th August, 1901, and Sir E. Grey's letter of the 23rd November, 1901, relative to piracy in the Persian Gulf, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to forward, for Lord Lansdowne's consideration, a copy of a letter from the Government of India urging that a further strong representation should be made to the Porte with a view to the arrest of the pirate Ahmad-bin-Selman, and the restitution of the property plundered by him.

Mr. Brodrick would suggest that steps might be taken to obtain from the Turkish Government an official assurance that immediate measures are being taken for discovering and capturing the offending parties, and especially Ahmad-bin-Selman.

Lord Lansdowne will observe that the Government of India are inclined to believe that Ahmad-bin-Selman is being purposely shielded by the Turkish authorities.

In the meantime the Government of India have been authorized by the Secretary of State on the 7th September last to invoke the aid of His Majesty's ships in the Persian Gulf if necessary.

I am, &c.
 Signed) A. GODLEY

Enclosure 1 in No. 17.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick

(Secret.)

Sir,
 WE have the honour to refer to the correspondence ending with your Secret telegram, dated the 8th September, 1901, regarding the recent acts of piracy committed in the Persian Gulf near Katif by Ahmad-bin-Selman.

2. The papers detailed in the annexed schedule are forwarded for information. It will be observed that, in October 1901, the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf reported the occurrence of piracy off the Arabian Coast, and that members of the Beni Hajar tribe, residing in the El Katir Peninsula, were held to have been concerned in at least one of the four cases mentioned in letter dated the 14th October, 1901, from Lacute and Colonel Keightley. In September 1902 that officer drew attention to the recurrence of acts of piracy, in the vicinity of El Katir and Bahrein, committed by a party of the same tribe under the leadership of one Ahmad-bin-Selman, a notorious bad character. Endeavours were made to secure steps being taken by the Turkish officials towards the arrest of Ahmad-bin-Selman. These endeavours resulted in a communication, dated the 15th December, 1902, from the Sublime Porte, stating that the pirate had left for Kuwait and could not consequently be arrested. It is, however, worthy of note that, in October 1902 it was reported that he had thrown himself on the mercy of the Mutessarif of Al Hasa, to whom he is stated to have personally handed two pearls, and was promised him pardon on condition that he divulged the names of his accomplices and that the latter gave up their share of the plunder. The statement that he had left for Kuwait was further refuted by Mr. Gaskin, Assistant Political Agent, Bahrein, on August 1903. The recent cases of piracy committed by Ahmad-bin-Selman go to show that Mr. Gaskin made a correct statement when he reported that the pirate had recently been advised to keep out of the way; the fact being that he is not arrested by the Turkish authorities, because they hope that as a cousin and subject of Sheikh Isa, Chief of Bahrein, who has been outlawed by the latter, he will prove a thorn in the side of that Chief's subjects.

3. We propose reviewing the more recent cases of piracy in the neighbourhood of Katif, Bahrein, and the El Katir Peninsula which have for long been subjected to continual depredations. In the year 1887 no fewer than seven serious piracies occurred between the months of July and October. These were reported in our despatch dated the 17th April, 1888. Of late years, there have been no such outbreaks as this, but the evil still continues. In 1890 four cases were reported. In 1900 there were five more cases. In 1901 there appears to have been complete immunity. In 1902 four

distinct acts of piracy were committed by one gang under the leadership of Ahmad-bin-Selman, while in 1903 he again appeared in the vicinity of Katif, but, beyond an unsuccessful attempt upon a Bahrein dhow in the vicinity of the pearl banks off the Katir coast, no act of piracy was reported.

The details of the several piracies committed in 1890, 1900, and 1902 are as follows—

(1.) In February 1899 a Persian boat was plundered off Abu Zulf on the El Katir coast. It was subsequently reported, however, that it was doubtful whether this was a

(2.) On the 11th August, 1890, a boat belonging to a Bahrein subject was attacked and plundered near the Sakka pearl banks in the vicinity of Katif. The pirates are said to have belonged to Daren in the same neighbourhood. The value of the property stolen was not reported, but a small proportion is said to have been recovered. How recovery was effected is not clear. Sir Nicholas O'Connor was, however, directed to instruct His Britannic Majesty's Consul at Basrah to see that in future the British Government would itself deal with such cases. Certain of the offenders were eventually imprisoned for long terms by the Turkish authorities.

(3.) On the 10th August, 1899, a boat belonging to a Bahrein subject was attacked and carried off near Dhakira. The boat was subsequently recovered through Sheikh Ahmed bin Thani of El Katir.

(4.) In August 1899 two boats belonging to British Indian subjects were plundered at Dibal on the El Katir coast. One of the boats carried off and abandoned near Zohara.

The total value of the property stolen was over 10,000 rupees, 67 rupees, was recovered through Sheikh Ahmed bin Thani.

(5.) On the 17th August, 1900, a Bahrein boat was plundered on the Kura pearl bank near Ras Tanurah by men from Daren. One of the persons in the boat was drowned, and property valued at 3,524 rupees was carried off. As the result of representations to the Mutessarif of Al Hasa, a sum of 200 rs. 8 a., together with four pearls, was eventually restored to the owner.

(6.) On the 2nd September, 1900, a party of men, said to belong to the Beni Hajar tribe, attacked a Bahrein boat some 7 miles north of Bahrein, and carried off property valued at 731 rupees. No redress was obtained.

(7.) On the same date an attack was made by men of the Beni Hajar tribe on some Arabs in the Island of Um Nasam off Bahrein.

(8.) On the 15th August, 1900, a Bahrein boat was attacked on the Gracia pearl bank 6 miles north of Ras Rekkah. Property valued at 315 rs. 8 a. was stolen. No redress was obtained.

(9.) On the 6th September, 1900, a Bahrein boat was attacked off Qhair. Two persons were wounded, and considerable property (value not stated) was plundered. Most of the property belonged to Turkish subjects, and was recovered by the Mutessarif of Al Hasa, who punished the tribe responsible for the outrage. None of the property belonging to the Bahrein owners appears to have been restored.

(10.) Early in July 1902 Ahmad-bin-Selman and party stole a boat from Nohut. Stress of weather on the 19th July drove him back to a point north of Qhair, where an armed party was sent against him by the inhabitants of Qhair, and he had to abandon the boat and flee.

(11.) Later in July 1902 the same party stole a boat at Soudah, a village on the Island of Tarut. The Katirakam of Katif was reported to have sent an armed party after them. They, however, crossed to the Island of Um Nasam, and

(12.) On the 4th August captured a Bahrein dhow of 28 tons burden with gear. The vessel was lying at Um Nasam to load lime for Bahrein. The crew, with three donkeys and drivers, were taken to Thabran.

(13.) On the 12th August, 1902, by the aid of the above-mentioned boat, they plundered another Bahrein boat of Them, taking all its gear, utensils, and about 4,000 dollars worth of pearls and 50 dollars in cash from a passenger, a native of Bahrein. They then sailed for Dohat-al-Thalam at Thabran, where they landed with their plunder. The owner of the boat took advantage of the opportunity and escaped with his boat—the one stolen off Um Nasam by the pirates. No redress is reported to have been secured in any of these four cases.

4. We venture to submit the following observations on the incidents which are recited above. The offenders in all the cases appear to have come from the main land. Where they have been residents of territories which are nominally subject to the Ottoman Porte, endeavours have been made to enlist the co-operation of the Turkish

[illegible]

We have no

[illegible]

_____ recently received by n _____
_____ b _____ TO
_____ these

... with me concerning ...

44 JULY 1983

$\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}$

Haji Ahmad, a Bahraini, on
residence ending with this Office
of Bahrain, vide this

The first of these is the fact that the
 second of these is the fact that the
 third of these is the fact that the
 fourth of these is the fact that the
 fifth of these is the fact that the
 sixth of these is the fact that the
 seventh of these is the fact that the
 eighth of these is the fact that the
 ninth of these is the fact that the
 tenth of these is the fact that the

I can only suggest that if my proposal to murder of Shrikh Selman-beg-Dian
e 12th August, 1801, the opportunity

Incl. sure 5 in No. 17.

Government of India to Lieutenant-Colonel Kimball.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. regarding certain purchases made during 1967 by the U.S. Coast Guard.

2 You were authorized in the letter dated the 21st October, 1901 to arrange for a [redacted] at some convenient opportunity with a [redacted] who has been taken by [redacted] officials to punish the murderers of Sheikh Selman bin-Haj-el-Khalifa and others of [redacted]. It was made at the [redacted] that is here [redacted] acknowledgment [redacted] Turkish author [redacted] held responsible [redacted] commander of the vessel [redacted] himself to inquire [redacted] which occurred within the period of [redacted]

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and titles, including "The Hon. Mr. Justice" and "The Hon. Mr. Justice".

Life in the No

1. General A. J. ...

(Continued)

I HAVE the honour to reference to the letter of the 11th November, 1901 from the Under Secretary of the Government of India on the subject of the proposed extension of the Indian Coast at Perambur.

23. The exact position of affair is as follows: up to now, as far as we know, if any of the perpetrators of the murder of Kalfas of Hanoi, the perpetrator of the certain murder is the one who was arrested on the 14th Oct. 1951.

Kate I have ascertained that the stock of her
of her stock the find
the large part of pearls sent by the K. to C.
referred to in case II are found to be pearls
Age
tooth of K.

March 11, 1914
10th November, 1914
1219 runs from the
to the (Chel) water it

I forward _____
Although the propo _____ R 1 _____

for us to punish it.

I have no objection to Mr. Katr's statement, but I think it is better that the cases should be allowed to drop. During the absence of Mr. Katr has been reported, and he has recognized his responsibility and has taken the measures. In the event of any future case occurring in which it is the duty of Mr. Katr Peninsular, I would suggest that I may be able to help him as I can in the future.

[illegible]

ber of them remain in Kaitum they are not in Kait now and the piracy which they have committed took place elsewhere than in Kait -
of
Porker
K.
in accordance with the Hedoum Arabs are
them We are in such relations with them I am not responsible to them unless they have claims against me and they are not responsible to me except when they are under my obligation. For whatever they do and whenever they rob men, I exert myself, and I do so in peace God knows that I do not fail in my endeavours
More ti not do. You say that the Kait and Bahrein people do not take

care of their boats and allow them to be used by pirates by which they (the boat owners) suffer loss; do not believe that such is the case. Also that they (boat owners) could prevent them (the pirates) if they saw them near the shore; this is not possible, because the number of the crew is small and they have no power to oppose or prevent.

Inclosure 9 in No. 17.

Government of India to Lieutenant-Colonel Kimball.

Fort William, February 11, 1902

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated the 25th December 1901, on the subject of certain piracies which occurred off the El-Katr Peninsula during the years 1899 and 1900.

Your letter deals with three cases of piracy, two of which occurred in August 1899, and the third dated from August 1900. In the third case the stolen property is valued at 115 ru. 8 a. only, but in the two earlier cases property of the value of 1,000 rupees is alleged to have been plundered. It is understood that of the property stolen in the two piracies which occurred in August 1899, a portion valued at about 2,000 rupees has been recovered by Sheikh Ahmed-bin-Thani, the Ruler of El-Katr, but that no effort has been made by him to recover the remainder of the property which was looted on those two occasions or to exact redress from the persons who committed the smaller outrage at Garamia Pearl Bank in August 1900. You now suggest that, in order to obtain compensation for the sufferers by these piracies, the property of the El-Katr Chief in Bahrain should be attached, or that, as an alternative, the cases should be allowed to drop. A third alternative, which was suggested in your letter, dated the 19th November, 1900, would be to send a boat expedition to punish the villages from which the pirates embarked.

3. The Government of India have decided, in view of the time which has elapsed since the occurrence of these piracies, and of certain pre-occupations in other parts of the Persian Gulf, that active measures for the exacting of redress from the Sheikh of El-Katr or from the offending villages cannot now be wisely or profitably undertaken, and that the cases must be allowed to drop. Having regard, however, to the language held by Colonel Meade to the Sheikh in November 1899, the Government of India have come to their present decision with reluctance, and they cannot but regret that, owing to the want of definite proposals from two successive Political Residents, the opportunity for exacting full and timely reparation for these outrages should have been allowed to pass. In the opinion of the Government of India, some speedy measures of redress should be adopted in future if such outrages are repeated; and, in the event of any fresh case of piracy occurring off the El-Katr Peninsula, the Political Resident should not only cause the property of the Katr Chief in Bahrain to be attached until redress is given, but should also submit proposals at once for a boat expedition against the villages immediately concerned, if that appears to be the best and most effective method of inflicting punishment and enforcing reparation.

Inclosure 10 in No. 17.

Lieutenant-Colonel Kimball to Government of India.

Shiraz, September 13, 1902

IN continuation of the correspondence ending with your letter dated the 6th February, 1902, I have the honour to report, for the information of the Government of India, the recurrence of acts of piracy, in the vicinity of El-Katr and Bahrain, committed by a party of Beni Hajir Arabs under the leadership of one Ahmad-bin-Selman, a notorious bad character.

2. Early in July 1902 a man succeeded in stealing a boat from Sehat, but stress of weather on the 18th July drove him back to a point north of Qajar, on hearing of which the militia of Sehat sent a small boat party against him, obliging him to abandon his craft and flee ashore.

* Secret, dated November 1901

3. Some days later Ahmad and his gang stole a boat at Sehat with which they crossed to the island of Um Numan and on the 24th August captured a Bahraini boat.

some ten days later they waylaid and robbed another Bahraini boat, off Thaein in the Katr Peninsula, of its entire gear and utensils as well as of cash and pearls, the property of a trader on board, to the total value of some 5,400 dollars, and then proceeded to Zohat Tbalum in Thauran, south of Katf, in Turkish territory, where they lunched with their plunder.

4. The Assistant Political Agent, Bahrain, informs me that Ahmad-bin-Selman, of whose nationality I am not yet aware, had been residing recently at Sweisima, in El-Katr territory, where his family now is, and as these piracies seem to have occurred in El-Katr waters, while some of the property plundered from the first Bahraini boat was disposed of at places under the jurisdiction of the Sheikh of El-Katr, it seems a case to apply the orders conveyed in paragraph 3 of your letter above quoted, and I have instructed the Assistant Political Agent accordingly, who, I may mention, had already warned Sheikh Ahmad-bin-Thani that he would be held responsible, and had also requested the Kaimakam of Kaif to co-operate in suppressing Ahmad and his gang.

5. His Britannic Majesty's Consul at Basorah has been requested to issue strict orders to his subordinates to take energetic measures, and inform me by return of post, to depute a gunboat to Bahrain with a view to concerting measures, either by means of a boat expedition or otherwise, to put down this gang.

6. I have not considered it advisable to accede to a request of the Sheikh bin of Bahrain that he might be permitted to dispatch an expedition against him, owing to the probability that the pursuit would lead the Bahrainese into Turkish waters and possibly into Turkish territories, and thus produce

Inclosure 11 in No. 17.

Lieutenant Colonel Kimball to Government of India

Basorah, September 22, 1902

IN continuation of this office letter dated the 11th September 1902, on the subject of piracy committed by Arabs under the leadership of Ahmad-bin-Selman, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, copy of a letter which I have received from His Britannic Majesty's Consul, Basorah, on the subject.

Inclosure 12 in No. 17.

Consul Wretling to Lieutenant Colonel Kimball

Basorah, September 12, 1902

I enclose herewith copies of two letters I have addressed to the Wali of Basorah on the subject of piracy.

I hear that the Turkish gunboat "Kahd-el-Rahr" is shortly to be sent down the coast but as the Turkish Government seems unable to maintain order either by land or sea in the districts for which it is responsible

Inclosure 13 in No. 17.

Consul Wretling to Mustafa Nouri Pasha.

Basorah, August 22, 1902

I have the honour to inform you that a notorious outlaw named Ahmad-bin-Selman has collected a band of 100 men from the Katf district and is committing piracies in those waters. He is

actually in possession of a large Bahrein sailing vessel which he captured at the island of Um Nasan, it is very necessary that he should be captured.

The British Agent has already communicated with the Kaimakam of Katif about this matter, and I beg that your Excellency will also send the necessary instructions to the spot.

Inclosure 14 in No. 17.

Consul Wrotislaw to Mustafa Nouri Pasha.

Bussorah, September 3, 1902.

WITH reference to my letter to your Excellency of the 22nd August, I have the honour to inform your Excellency that the pirate Ahmad-bin-Selman has employed the vessel which he captured at Um Nasan in the capture of another Bahrein boom near Thaein, from which he looted money and pearls to the value of 5,400 rupias (sic).

After committing this crime the pirates are reported to have returned to Dolat territory. Considering that the previous pirates referred to in my letter of the 10th December 1901, still remain unpunished, I beg that your Excellency will kindly advise whether the resources at the disposal of the local Turkish authorities are sufficient to insure the arrest and punishment of these marauders or whether it is desirable that a British vessel of war should be sent to assist in maintaining the security of the coast of Katif.

Inclosure 15 in No. 17.

Mustafa Nouri Pasha to Consul Wrotislaw.

(Translation.)

September 8, 1902.

HAVING read your letter of the 3rd September, 1902, I beg to say that, on receipt of your letter of the 22nd August, the necessary communications were made to the Governor of Nejd and that on receipt of reply to a second and urgent message to him pointing out the serious nature of the question, the viceroy will take the necessary steps and endeavour to procure the restitution of the stolen property and the

to help in the matter, thanks to the protecting arm of the Pashah.

Sent to His Majesty's Resident and Consul-General, Bussorah, with the compliments of the undersigned.

Inclosure 16 in No. 17.

Lieutenant-Colonel Kimball to Government of India.

Bussorah, December 8, 1902.

I HAVE the honour to invite a reference to the correspondence ending with my letter dated the 22nd September, 1902, on the subject of certain piracies committed upon Bahrein boats by Ahmad-bin-Selman.

As a result of further inquiries, it transpired that the pirate Ahmad-bin-Selman is not a subject of the Chief of Katif. He belongs to the Al Khafja family of Bahrein, and is, therefore, a subject of the Chief of Bahrein. He has, however, been for some time an outlaw from Bahrein and has resided in Katif, but he had left Katif long before the present piracies occurred, and had removed to Turkish territory, whence he set forth on his piratical expedition. His family is living at present in Bahrein. It would not, therefore, be just to hold the Chief of Katif responsible; and the Chief of Bahrein, who was consulted in the matter has stated that he does not think that the Chief of Katif is in any way responsible to him on account of these piracies.

acted under the circumstances to take any steps with regard to the Katif property in Bahrein.

There is no doubt that the pirate Ahmad-bin-Selman is now in Turkish territory, where the proceeds of the piracy on the Bahrein boat committed off Katif were taken.

From a recent report from the Assistant Political Agent at Bahrein dated the 30th November, 1902, copy of which is herewith forwarded, it appears that he has actually been in the hands of the Turkish authorities. It is very desirable that steps should now be taken to prevent this pirate from doing any further mischief, and I will bring the facts to the knowledge of His Britannic Majesty's Consul at Bussorah.

3. When I was recently at Bahrein, the Chief spoke to me on the subject of piracies, and said that he would be very glad if permission could be granted to him to

information reached him of the whereabouts of a pirate, and that, if he was able to act immediately upon the receipt of such information, and was permitted to send away an armed dhow in pursuit, he was confident that he would be able to impose a check on piracies in the neighbourhood of Bahrein. He expressed the opinion that the fact of it being known that he had such permission from the British Government would of itself act as a deterrent to intending pirates, and he readily agreed to abide by any restrictions which the British Government might choose to impose as to the limits within which his boats might cruise. He agreed to consult the Political Officer at Bahrein prior to sending an armed dhow to sea, and also to put a responsible and trustworthy official in charge of the dhow which he sent in pursuit of pirates. I informed the Chief that I would refer his request to the Government of India, as I could not myself give him the permission, and I instructed Mr. Gaskin to submit an official report to me on the subject.

4. The Government of India is aware of the difficulties which exist in the way of our ships of war taking any active steps in the matter of these piracies which generally occur towards the close of the purling season. The information about a piracy only reaches us after the piracy has been committed, and in any case it is practically impossible for our ships of war to put down this kind of piracy.

I am inclined, therefore, to think that the Chief of Bahrein might be given the permission for which he asks on the conditions that before he sends an armed boat to sea, the permission of the Assistant Political Agent at Bahrein is first asked, that one of his sons or other responsible person is put in charge of the boat, and that the operations of the boat are confined to the seas between a point north of Ras Tanoura and eastward round the Katir Peninsula towards the neighbourhood of Al-Bucan.

Inclosure 17 in No. 17.

Mr. Gaskin to Lieutenant Colonel Kimball.

Bahrein, November 30.

ENDING with this office letter, dated the 21st September, 1902, I have the honour to report that one named Sayyid Abdulrah-bin-Brahim, a connection of Sayyid-Ah-bin-Husein, the victim of the piracy committed by Ahmad-bin-Selman in Katir waters, on the 12th August, 1902, wrote to Sayyid Tahib, the Mutesarrif of Al-Hasa, regarding the piracy, begging him to recover the stolen property; and from the Mutesarrif's reply, dated the 22nd October, 1902, to Sayyid Abdulrah-bin-Brahim, it appears that Ahmad-bin-Selman has thrown himself on the mercy of the Mutesarrif, who has promised him pardon on condition that he divulges the names of his accomplices, who are to give up their share of the plunder, that two pearls have been recovered from Ahmad, and they are being kept in safe custody until the rest of the stolen property is recovered; and that the slave boy was recovered, and had been sent to Bahrein.

Since the receipt of the Mutesarrif's letter, the slave boy has come to Bahrein. It will be observed from the context of the letter, a translation of which is transmitted for your information, that the pirate is evidently in Al-Hasa, and if the Mutesarrif desired it he can easily be taken into custody, and information from other sources corroborates these facts, but it seems that the policy of the Turks is to take no notice of matters referred to them by our Government, and they are ready to move in cases which are reported to them direct by the Chief of Bahrein or his subjects.

As experience has shown that the action of His Majesty's ships and our reference to the Turkish Government for redress have hitherto proved futile, it remains that some more effective measures be adopted to put a stop to the recurrence of piracies in these waters.

[1516]

* 6

I therefore venture to bring forward, for your consideration, a suggestion of the Chief of Bahrein, that he may be allowed to assist in the matter of putting down piracy. He has repeatedly expressed to me his desire to obtain the permission of the Government of India to have in readiness during the pearling season, an armed boat under one of his sons to proceed against the pirates directly information is received of their having taken to sea. In his remarks to me he laid much stress on the fact that, though the Government of India have been good enough to take up all cases of piracy reported to them, and such measures as have been possible under the difficult circumstances have been taken, it is unfortunate that, owing to the lapse of time usually occurring between the date on which the pirates are committed and the arrival of His Majesty's ship of war on the scene, the pirates are able to get away, and to the apathy of the Turkish Government in matters concerning Bahrein, the frequent references to that Government generally prove abortive; and he thinks, and is in agreement with him, that local measures are likely to prove a success.

The fact that the pirates get to know that the Chief of Bahrein has been given permission to take active measures against them, and that they are likely to be checked on their predatory expeditions at sea, will in itself, in my opinion, be a check on them, and, as general information of intended expeditions is forthcoming prior to their start, the Chief can fall in with them before any serious mischief is done. I am of opinion that so long as the Chief on each occasion consults the Assistant Political Agent, and limits his action to pursuing pirates only and confining his independent operations or giving assistance to a British gun-boat whenever one is present within the seas between 5° 20' and 26° 30' north latitude and eastward from entering Turkish waters when a Turkish gun-boat is present, there can be no serious objection.

Inclosure 18 in No. 17.

Sayyid Thalib to Sayyid Abdulrahman-Hanahim.

Translation.)

(After compliments.)

October 22 1902.

I HAVE received your letter dated the 11th November, 1902, and am glad that you state this has been understood.

Ahmed bin Saleh asked for mercy, and his taking refuge has been accepted on condition that he will give the names of his companions and each of them gives up his share of the plunder. I have found in his possession two pearls only, and they are my sole booty until the final results are obtained. I have sent you your freed slave, and, please God, shortly I will do the necessary towards the discovering of your property.

May you continue to prosper.

Inclosure 19 in No. 17.

Captain de Vere Hunt to Government of India.

Bahrein, July 23, 1903.

In reference to the correspondence dealing with the capture of the pirate Ahmed bin Saleh.

In Bahrein waters, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, copy of the correspondence which has passed between me and the Acting Consul at Busrah regarding the reappearance of the pirate Ahmed bin Saleh in the vicinity of Katif.

Inclosure 20 in No. 17.

Captain de Vere Hunt to Acting Consul Crow.

(Telegraphic.)

July 13, 1903.

I AM informed that the notorious pirate Ahmed bin-Selman, with three or four companions, is with the Amair tribe at present encamped on outskirts of Katif, and is awaiting a favourable opportunity to recommence his piratical career.

Can you induce the Vah to take vigorous action with a view to his arrest?

Inclosure 21 in No.

Acting Consul Crow to Captain de Vere Hunt.

Busrah, July 15, 1903.

ON receipt of your telegram of the 13th instant in regard to the movements of Ahmed bin-Selman, I called on the Vah and handed him a translation of the substance of your message. I pointed out that he had already addressed the Mutesarrif of Nejd several times on the subject, and had received no reply. I reminded him that Ahmed bin-Selman was a standing menace to traffic in Bahrein waters, and that orders were sent by the Porte in 1902 to pursue and capture him. I asked the Vah to give his serious attention to the matter, more especially as the date season was now approaching and I anticipated interference with the Indian sailing season.

His Excellency took the translation of the telegram and promised to give the matter his immediate attention.

Inclosure 22 in No. 17.

Captain de Vere Hunt to Government of India.

Bahrein, July 23, 1903.

IN continuation of my letter, dated the 23rd instant, regarding the reappearance of the pirate Ahmed bin-Selman in the vicinity of Katif, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, copy of a letter which I have received from the Assistant Political Agent, Bahrein, on the subject.

Inclosure 23 in No. 17.

Mr. Gaskin to Captain de Vere Hunt.

Bahrein, July 28, 1903.

IN continuation of my Report dated the 11th July, 1903, I have the honour to report that, in accordance with my advice, the Chief of Bahrein sent a detective to watch Ahmed bin-Selman's movements, and last night the Chief sent me a message to the effect that the person sent by him to the man and has just returned, and reported that the pirate, with four Amair tribesmen, has obtained a boat and is now at Sa'at, 4 miles below Katif, preparing to put to sea.

There are generally a large Bahrein boat or two at the Island of Um Nuan, and it is likely that the pirates will make for that island with a view to obtain a boat suitable to their purpose. I have instructed the Chief to send about ten reliable men to the island to capture the pirates should they land there. Um Nuan being one of the Bahrein group and belonging to the Chief, no complication can arise. I have also advised the Chief to warn all boats putting to sea to keep a look-out for the pirates.

The Turks have had ample warning, but the only action they will take will be to send a small boat, with five or six soldiers, from Katif across to Bahrein and back again, to impress us with an idea that they are looking for the pirates.

Inclosure 24 in No. 17.

Captain de Vere Hunt to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, August 12, 1903.

INFORMATION has been brought to me of the appearance of a gang of Beni Hajir pirates—probably that of Ahmed-bin-Selman—in the vicinity of the pearl banks off the Kutr Coast, and of an unsuccessful attempt by them upon a dhow.

(Addressed to the Consul at Basmorah; repeated to Foreign, Simla.)

Inclosure 25 in No. 17.

Captain de Vere Hunt to Government of India.

Bushire, August 6, 1903.

IN continuation of my letter, dated the 27th ultimo, regarding the reappearance of the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman in the vicinity of Katif, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, copy of a letter which I have received from the Assistant Political Agent, Bahrein, on the subject.

Inclosure 26 in No. 17.

Mr. Gaskin to Captain de Vere Hunt

Bahrein, August 4, 1903.

IN continuation of my letter dated the 19th July, I have the honour to forward, for your information, a translation of a letter I have received from Sayyid Taleh Pasha, Mutesarrif of Al-Hassa, on the subject of the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman.

It would seem from the Mutesarrif's letter that the pirate had left the district when he was sought after by the Turka, and has gone towards Koweit; but I may state that the Kaimakam and the Mutesarrif's messenger have been misled, as Ahmed was at Annich near Katif at the time, and he was subsequently seen at Bahat, and, lastly, I hardly think that he would go to Koweit territory. Of course, it is quite possible that it may have been hinted to the pirate to leave the district and go in hiding with some tribe under Sheikh Mubarak; and with a view to warn Sheikh Mubarak, and, if possible, to effect the capture of the pirate, a letter may be addressed to him on the subject and request him to have the man seized and sent for trial to Bahrein, where ample evidence can be produced against him. The man is a native of Bahrein, and a cousin of Sheikh Isa, so there can be no objection to such a course being taken.

Inclosure 27 in No. 17.

Sayyid Taleh Pasha to Mr. Gaskin

20 Rabi-ul-Thani, 1321 (July 16, 1903).

(Translation.)

I HAD, ere this, replied to you by letter about the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman and his companions, whom you asked me to imprison.

I gave distinct orders to the agent of the Kaimakam of Katif to make inquiries with a view to his pursuing and capturing him. I sent this letter with one of my men in whom I have confidence, and he in company with the Kaimakam and the Commandant of the forces, Muhammad Ali Effendi, went to the house of Nasir bin-Mubarak and his neighbours, the Beni Hajir and made a secret search, giving out that they were searching for deserted soldiers. They, however, did not find him, and my messenger returned to me with a reply from the Kaimakam, stating that, according to authentic reports, the man had left some days ago towards Koweit along with his cousin, and they have been unable to capture them. I have strictly enjoined him not to neglect this matter, and on receiving news of their return towards Katif, he should pursue and capture

them, and inform me of the result at once. You may rest assured that whenever he returns he will be captured. Besides this, you may detail men to ascertain his whereabouts and inform me, when I shall carry out your wishes.

I have given him distinct orders to take the necessary action which may be in accordance with the laws and Government rules.

Inclosure 28 in No. 17.

Captain de Vere Hunt to Government of India

Bushire, August 27, 1903.

IN continuation of my letter dated the 6th instant, I have the honour to forward, received from His Britannic Majesty's Acting Consul, Basmorah, regarding the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman.

Inclosure 29 in No. 17.

Acting Consul Crow to Captain de Vere Hunt

Basmorah, August 17, 1903.

WITH reference to your endorsement of the 6th August and your telegram of the 12th and 16th August, I have the honour to inform you that the Wali has communicated to me a letter which he has received from the Mutesarrif of Hassa in reply to his inquiries about Ahmed-bin-Selman. The Mutesarrif states that the pirate has gone in the direction of Koweit, that the search and pursuit after him are being continued, and that there will be no further chance of his being arrested. If he returns he will be arrested, and his trial by default before the Court of Cassation in Nadj is proceeding. As requested by your telegram of the 16th August, I have to-day informed the Wali that, according to your information, he is still in the district of Katif, and bent on mischief, and I have asked his Excellency to direct the Mutesarrif to arrest him at the first opportunity.

Inclosure 30 in No. 17.

Captain de Vere Hunt to Government of India

Bushire, August 27, 1903.

IN continuation of my letter dated the 27th instant, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, a copy of the letter which I have received from the Assistant Political Agent, Bahrein, regarding an attempt made by the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman to seize a boat below Dammam near Katif.

Inclosure 31 in No. 17.

Mr. Gaskin to Captain de Vere Hunt.

Bahrein, August 22, 1903.

IN continuation of my letter dated the 15th August, I have the honour to report that the Chief of Bahrein sent me to-day a man named Abdulla al-Attaibi, whose boat Ahmed bin-Selman attempted to seize on the 15th instant below Dammam near Katif. A translation of Abdulla's statement recorded in my office is forwarded for your information.

There is no doubt in my mind that Ahmed never left Katif territory, and that he was at the time of the seizure of the boat below Dammam, and that he was with a deliberate view to mislead the Turkish authorities and stop their search after Ahmed, or by the Kaimakam to clear himself from blame for failing to seize him.

1510

H

[Faint, illegible text covering the left page]

[Faint, illegible text covering the right page]

sets from the D.

12 August 6, 1904. One Syed Selman arrived this evening from Katif to warn the Chief that the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman seized his boat with its crew at Safwa, near Kut f, and proceeded to sea.

13 August 12, 1904. It is reported that the pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman has plundered 2, in the Persian Gulf. Mohamed el Mehmed of Khir Caid, Basrah, is

20. August 24, 1904. It is reported by the Seaman has plundered a Persian sailing boat.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 9.)

India Office, January 7, 1905
WITH reference to Mr. V. L. L. letter of the 11th December and to Sir F. L. L. letter of the 11th December, and to the Marquess of Lansdowne, copy of correspondence with the Admiralty and of a telegram to the Viceroy, on the subject.

I am, &c.
Signed) A. GODLEY

Inclosure 1 in No. 18.

India Office to Admiralty

India Office, January 9, 1905
Sir, I AM directed by the Secretary of State for India to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 23rd December on the subject of the flags to be hoisted in the neighbourhood of Cape Musandam.

As regards the request of the Lords Commissioners for more precise information as to the object of erecting the flag-staffs and the proposed hoisting of a British flag with reference to the statement that the policy which dictated the ear-marking of the places in question has been terminated, I am directed to refer you to the Secret letter from the Government of India of the 11th December, 1902, and the Minute of the Viceroy inclosed therewith, which discuss fully the question of policy involved. That letter was communicated to

Foreign Office
February 19 3

of the Government of India and that Lord Lansdowne concurred in the proposal.

proved, and in their Secret

of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty with my letter of the 24th January, 1904, which also inclosed a copy of a letter to the Foreign Office of the same date on the subject. On the 3rd August, 1904, in a further letter to the Foreign Office of which a copy was sent to the Admiralty, with a letter of the same date, Mr. Brodrick informed that there was no objection to authority to carry out their proposal to erect the flag-staff at the entrance to the Persian Gulf.

was informed by the Foreign Office that the Government of India was accordingly informed, by a telegram of the 24th August, that the erection of the flag-staff at the entrance to the Persian Gulf was approved.

Brodrick expressed the views of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty were made known to him at an earlier date. He proposes now to bring the whole question before the Defence Committee. Pending their decision upon it, he has informed the Government of India of the objections expressed in your letter, and has instructed them to take no further action in the matter for the present. But before coming to a final decision, he would be glad to be favoured with the views of the Government of India as to the best means of carrying out the policy of the Admiralty.

station at Elphinstone Island, in order to prevent the acquisition by any foreign power of a position at the entrance to the Persian Gulf. It appears from the letter of the 17th February, 1904, referred to in the second paragraph of this letter that the Commissioners have no objection to this policy in itself.

I am, &c.
Signed) A. GODLEY

Inclosure 2 in No. 18

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Secret.)

(Telegraphic.)

India Office, December 30, 1904

of the 8th ultimo
Objection is taken by Admiralty, on naval grounds, to the hoisting of the flag in the neighbourhood of Cape Musandam, in view of the fact that the navy will be called upon to deal with the flag in the event of complications arising. Admiralty view is that, unless we are prepared to claim the places in question as British territory, the mere hoisting either of the Union Jack or the Blue Ensign will not prevent foreign nations from occupying the place jointly with ourselves, if they choose to hoist their flag alongside ours. Please suspend all further action in connection with hoisting of flags, pending result of reference which is being made to Defence Committee on the whole question. Admiralty have been asked for their views as to the best means of giving effect to the policy proposed in your letter dated the 23rd October, 1902, which was inclosed with them.

No. 19

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 9.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Resident, Aden, dated the 8th January, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, January 9, 1905.

the Secretary.

to withdraw the objectionable restriction which they wish to impose, troops are to be prohibited from visiting the nine cantons, a term and even, according to the Turkish interpretation, Ade, election from the Viceroy to the , 1904, specific reversion of territory , instead of the vague promise that the er, coupled with the condition that the in the vilayet of Yemen? Subject to Turkish Commissioner the line

contention unanswered."

(Reported to Viceroy)

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

Foreign Office, January 9, 1905.

that the

The Marquess of Lansdowne to M. Cambon.

Foreign Office, January 11, 1905.

Sir, I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Excellency's note of the 6th instant relative to the Muscat Arbitration.

His Majesty's Government have great pleasure in agreeing to M. Deles' suggestion that the fortnight's delay in the assembling of the Tribunal, which will be

The Hague without undue delivery of the Cases until

be sufficient that the two

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 17.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 11, 1905.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 25

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 12)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 30th December, 1904, relative to the Muscat Arbitration.

Office, January 11, 1905.

enclosure in No. 1

Mr. Brodrick to the Government of India

P.

India Office, December 30, 1904.

MUSCAT Arbitration. Your telegram of the 25th October last, proposed by French Government that list of flag-holders should be included memorandum to be sent in by them to the Tribunal.

The Marquess of Lansdowne

My dear Ambassador

I HAVE the honour to
the 5th inst.
policy of expan-
sion. I cheer-
fully accept

I can only state that it
Egyptian Government contemplates
the Arab question
would be entirely in accordance
it does not to believe that the
such a course

LANSDOWNE

is enclosed, supplementary to that already signed on the 17th October last, in regard
to the Persian Administration

India Office to Foreign Office (Received January 14)

Sir,

India Office, January 12, 1904

WITH reference to your letter of the 21st November, 1903, on the question
of protection being afforded by His Majesty's Consuls in Persia to natives of
Koweh, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to transmit, for Lord Lansdowne's
consideration, a copy of a letter from the Government of India advocating a
reconsideration of the position taken up by His Majesty's Government in your letter
above referred to.

It appears to Mr. Brodrick that, though natives of Koweh cannot be regarded
as British-protected persons, or be justiciable by the British Consular Tribunals in
Persia, it is for consideration whether we should claim for them in Persia the
same privileges as have been conceded to Afghans in Persia, viz., that "the
friendly recommendations and wishes of the British Government" on their behalf
should be accepted. Should this principle be recognized by the Persian Govern-
ment, the question of a claim to compensation being made in particular cases on
behalf of aggrieved natives of Koweh might then be considered.

With regard to the question of the flag, raised in the 7th paragraph of the
Government of India letter, Mr. Brodrick will be glad to be favoured with Lord
Lansdowne's views. The present proposal appears to Mr. Brodrick to be distinct
from that which was negatived by Lord Lansdowne in your letter of the 21st
September, 1901.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

* Printed separately

Inclosure 1 in No. 2.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

Sir,

Fort William, December 8, 1904.

WE have the honour to address you regarding our relations with Koweh, with
special reference to the question of the protection which His Majesty's Government
are prepared to grant to subjects of the Sheikh in Persian territory.

2. The question is one which has been brought into prominence by the action of
the Customs Department of the Persian Government, whose officious activity has
which have roused a strong popular feeling
a deliberate policy to destroy our prestige
of the Gulf. The details of these
occurrences are narrated in the inclosures of this despatch, and their principal features

while cruising in the "Muzaffari," overhauled a Koweh boat which he apparently
suspected of carrying arms. The vessel, which was stopped out of sight of land,
was taken to Lingah, where her cargo was found on examination to be innocent.
She was detained, however, for some days, and was not finally released until her
master had been fined a sum of 25 toman for an alleged technical breach of Customs

(b.) In June, one Mutarak-bin-Khalifa was detained with his vessel for eight
days at Sheyrah and twenty-one days at Lingah on suspicion of an alleged offence
at the Customs. Pending an investigation of the charge, he was required
to surrender as security a part of his cargo, and eventually, rather than incur
further delay, abandoned this portion of his freight, and left with his vessel for
Koweh.

(c.) In the same month a vessel of Sheikh Mulla bin "Mawadon," sailing
between Koweh and Fao with a cargo of wood and dates, was fired on and held up for
search by Persian Customs officials in the Shat-el-Arab.

(d.) In September a Koweh vessel, the "Fayez," bound for Bussoorah, was seized
in the Shat-el-Arab by the Customs ship "Muzaffari," and was only released on pay-
ment of a fine of twice the value of each of twelve muskets, which were declared by the
master to be carried for purposes of defence against pirates, a statement which was not
improbably true.

(e.) In June a Koweh subject, employed by the British India Steam
Company as a pilot for their mail steamers, was accused of having com-
mitted an offence at Bushire. The Political Resident wished to use his
influence on behalf of the accused, but the Turkish Consular Agent claimed to defend him
on the ground that he was a Turkish subject. The matter was referred to Tehran where
Sir Arthur Harcourt arranged that the case should be removed to the Court of the
Foreign Office Agent or Karguzar, so as to allow of a representative of the British
Consulate General attending at the trial. In agreeing to this course, however, the
Persian Government expressly intimated that their consent was based on the British
nationality of the Arab's employment, and abstained from committing themselves to
an acceptance of either the British or Turkish view as to the international status of
Koweh. Mention of this incident has been added, as the issue involved is the same,
though the case is of a somewhat different character to those preceding, and we do
not propose any further action in regard to it.

3. The present is not the first occasion on which the question of the status of
Koweh subjects has come under review. The point was raised in 1900 in connection
with the importation of certain arms into Persia by a merchant said to be a subject of
the Sheikh. Our Political Resident in the Persian Gulf was then informed by Lord
Lansdowne that Koweh was not under formal British protection, though we had
granted the Sheikh our good offices, that natives of Koweh could not be claimed as
British-protected persons, nor would they be justiciable by British Consular Tribunals
in Persia. It was added that interference to protect any Koweh subject was
undesirable, and that action on the part of the Resident was unnecessary until he was
appealed to, but that endeavours should be made to ascertain the facts as to the
man's nationality and the Sheikh's wishes as to resisting Turkish claims to jurisdiction
over him.

(1516)

K

Inclosure 3 in 4

Government of India to Major Cox

(Telegraphic)

PLEASE refer to your telegram of the 30th June. The Turks claim the Koweit Arab. Please send by post the reply received from Sir A. Hardinge (Repeated to His Majesty's Minister at Tehran.)

Inclosure 4 in No. 26.

Major Cox to Government of India

Bushire, July 3, 1904

IN continuation of my telegram of the 30th June, repeating a message sent by me to His Majesty's Minister, Tehran, on the subject of good offices which it was desired to extend to a Koweit Arab in the employ of the British India Company as mail pilot, I have the honour to append for information a paraphrase of his Excellency's reply

Inclosure 5 in No. 2

Sir A. Hardinge to Major Cox

Tehran, July 2, 1904

(Telegraphic)

YOUR telegram of the 30th June.

In reply to a message from me yesterday, Mushir-ed-Dowleh has promised to obtain

the status of Koweit

Inclosure 6 in

Major Cox to Government of India

Bushire, July

CERTAIN cases have recently occurred in which the Nacodas of Koweit do not appear to have been needlessly oppressed by the Customs officials, and the Resident Agent at Lingah asks to be informed definitely as to what amount of protection he is entitled to afford them.

In one case the late Director-General of Bushire Customs, M. Dambasin, while cruising in the "Muzafferi" last April, overhauled a Koweit dhow at sea between Hindarabi and Kala Island, in the hopes of finding arms on her. Being unable to search her at sea, he towed her into Lingah, where he had her cargo taken out and detained her several days. Finding her cargo innocent (it consisted of wooden rafters from Kishm), he allowed it to be put back, but (as if to show that his action was justified) he found the Nacoda guilty of neglecting some technical detail of Customs Regulations and fined him 25 tohans.

The Nacoda went away, and that in the first place he had been seized on the high seas out of sight of land, and that, secondly, though his cargo was innocent and he had not intentionally committed breach of rules, he had been delayed for several days and eventually fined 25 tohans.

The Director-General was approached informally by my predecessor, and the process was repeated by me without any satisfactory result.

A second complaint has been received from the Resident Agent at Lingah, giving details of another case, in which he alleges that a Koweit dhow, with a certificate from Sheikh Mubarak to say that the dhow and cargo were Koweit owned, has been mulcted of twenty bags of wheat and has been detained several days. This case is still under correspondence.

37

4. It is not, however, with regard to individual cases or the details of them that I have thought it necessary to trouble Government. My object is to invite the consideration of the Government of India to the general question of the extent to which protection or good offices can now be afforded to subjects of the Sheikh of Koweit when in difficulties of the kind above explained.

It is evident to me that if we wish to maintain our influence with Sheikh Mubarak, much less to strengthen it, we must accept some responsibility to see ordinary justice meted out to his subjects in places where we have Agents, as far as lies in our power. I am also inclined to deduce from one or two local incidents that there is some tendency on the part of local officials, possibly prompted from outside, to make a special set against Koweit subjects at the present time.

With an Agent at Koweit, and in view of Sheikh Mubarak's energetic entreaties, we shall henceforward be in a stronger position to use our influence in the direction desired; and, while on this subject, I venture to inquire whether we might not now press the Sheikh to adopt a distinctive device for his flag, which would enable the vessels of his subjects to be identified.

At present the fact that Koweit dhows fly the Turkish flag unaltered in any way makes it easy for Customs officials to ignore their Koweit origin, and encourages Turkish Consular representatives who wish to obtrude their expensive protection.

Inclosure 7 in No. 26

Sheikh Mubarak to Resident

(Telegraphic)

March 31, 1904

AFTER giving details of the seizure and detention of a Koweit dhow:—

"And we will not endure this treatment, and your sense of honour will not permit that those who are under your protection shall be treated in such a way.

"Therefore have I made this appeal to you

"And in this connection, when we see that we get protection from you, we shall feel honoured, and so will our subjects. And such treatment is hoped for and is an attribute of your glorious Government.

If, on the other hand, you take no notice of this and such tyranny over our subjects who ply their seafaring pursuits is not put a stop to by you, then we shall be obliged to look out for some other condition of affairs which will give us relief from it. The result of it is that all our subjects who travel are in a state of alarm, and all we ask of you is to see that the trade of our seafaring subjects is not brought to a standstill by such treatment.

Finally, we beg your kind solicitude for the protection of all our subjects in any direction which will honour them and preserve them from tyranny.

"May you be preserved, and salams."

Inclosure 8 in No. 26

Major Cox to Government of India

Bushire, August 13, 1904.

IN continuation of my letter, dated the 3rd July, 1904, regarding the Arab pilot, Khalid, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, a copy of the marginally noted despatch which I have addressed to His Majesty's Minister at Tehran.

Inclosure 9 in No. 26.

Major Cox to Sir A. Hardinge

Bushire, August 4, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to refer to the case of the Arab pilot, Khalid, regarding which we have been in telegraphic correspondence.

In his telegram of the 12th July, Mr Grant Duff informed me that instructions had been sent three days previously to Bushire for the speedy disposal of the case in

L 161

L

the presence of a Residency representative, but it was not till the 14th that orders were received by the Karguzar. He took up the case on the 18th, and admitted my Assistant Surgeon Lobo

_____ were found to be that the _____ were good friends, dined and got drunk in company, and in the morning _____ found he was wounded. Neither _____ could remember how it happened.

The wound was a very simple one and was under treatment at our dispensary, and was going on very well, when the man was prevented from coming by the Derya Begi's order, and practically kept in custody by him.

On the negro's appearance at the trial, the wound was examined by a Peruvian doctor and our Assistant Surgeon, and found to have a plug inside it, so as to aggravate the wound and keep it open.

It was taken out, and the wound is quite healed, and the man completely recovered.

The Karguzar disposed of the case on the 16th, as far as he was concerned, but had to report his conclusions to Tehran. Nearly three weeks have now elapsed, and he has received no orders. The plot, Khalid, having been in custody at the Residency for five weeks, and the British Indian Company being in urgent need of his services, I released him on the 21st instant, after taking security and a guarantee from the Company that they would keep him on board their steamers and produce him when required.

11 closure 10 in 8

Major Cox to Government of India

Telegraphic, 1

Bezhire, September 13, 1904

I HAVE received the following telegram from His Britannic Majesty's Consul at M. Hamadah

"It is reported that, without referring to the Sheikh at Mohammurah, a national ship has arrived at the mouth of the Shat-el-Arab, and is looking for contraband."

that he will withdraw the guard and will not be responsible for the safety of Arab if the boat remains there. If he withdraws the guard, it is probable

(Addressed to L. Hardinge; repeated to the Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department.)

Enclosure 11 in No. 2.

No. of Cox to Government of India

Telegraphic, 1

Bushong, September 18, 1904.

IN continuation of my telegram dated 14th September, Director-General, Customs, in "Persepolis" has now joined "Muxasferi" in Shat-el-Arab, and both are busy. It is important that "Merlin," or other ship, should be sent back as soon as possible.

(A. Addressed Foreign Department; repeated the Political Agent at Muscat for Senior Naval Officer, Tehran informed.)

Enclosure 12 in No. 1.

Government of India to Sir A. Hardinge.

PLEASE refer to Major Cox's telegrams dated the 14th and 18th September, 1904, respectively. Under the Agreement of 1902, the Sheikh was to be subordinate to the Ministry of Customs only. The Arabistan Customs were separated from the Gulf Customs. Does not the visit of the Bushra Director in "Persepolis" constitute a direct violation of the Arrangement between the Persian Government and the Sheikh?

We have no information if the Sheikh omitted to lend his boats to the local Customs officers as provided in the Arrangement; but, if he did not, the presence in his jurisdiction of outside Customs men would be a serious matter. His approval is required to the appointment of such officers.

Enclosure 13 in No. 26.

r Cox to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, September 24, 1904.

"Persepolis" and "Muzafferi" returned Bushire yesterday, bringing one Kowait dhow. Am inquiring into reasons for seizure.

Enclosure 14 to No. 20

Captain Trevor to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Buxhire, September 27, 1904.

PLEASE refer to your telegram dated the 23rd September.
I have heard on good authority that, on the 24th September, the Director of Customs at Mohammerah submitted the following report to the Ministry of Customs:

"Having received a report to the effect that a large number of rifles had been shipped from Muscat for Gombah, which is at the mouth of the Shat-el-Arab, where there is no custom-house, I sent 'Muzafferi' there for a few days simply to seize the arms. Forty-two rifles and nearly 6,000 cartridges have been found and confiscated. Muzafferi left some days ago for Bushire."

He does not mention having applied to the Sheikh for boats. I am having
thirteen Goolah and Fao: one of them, which had fourteen rifles on board, was
leased on payment of a fine of 1,200 tomans. Twenty-eight rifles on board, has been detained at Bushire pending the payment of a
fine of 1,200 tomans.

McDonall's good offices have been accepted unofficially, but the Director-General says that he is unable to discuss the matter here as the report has been submitted to Tehran.

(Address to the Legation at Tehran.)

Enclosure 15 in No.

Mr. Grant Duff to Government of India.

Telegraphic 3

Tehran, September 30, 1944

PLEASE see your telegram dated the 21st September
The Director of Customs states that the steamer "Muzafferi" has been sent to
contribute arms at Goshah. I am pointing out to him that Mohammurah Customs are
of the steamer without apparently consulting the Sheikh of Mohammurah was
unjustifiable and likely to lead to misunderstanding.

The Persian Government do not know that we are aware of their written Agreement with the Sheikh (please see Sir A. Hardinge's despatch No. 167, dated the 5th December, 1902.)

(Addressed to the Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department.)

(Telegraph)

I HAVE 30. 10. 1904
Tehran

"My telegram
His Majesty's Minister at
Tehran"

Confidential

IN

subject of

Arab. I have

India, copies of two

Majesty's Minister at

the Customs at

Shah-el-Arab. without

I HAVE

Sardar Arfa

Shah-el-Arab

and was stopping and

he was able, as he could

find the

and inform me officially

Basrah to be sent to His Majesty's Cons
Inlets, and Haji Raza Tujar promised that the
days to give time for a reply to be received. I have
subject. He points out that, although

the "Muzaffari" has been seen

mainly, as Governor, he should have been warned
trouble by sending men of his own to be present

boats. He understands they stop both sea and river

creaks, so that a collision might occur with the

men. Thirdly, he is warden of the marches (Sarhad) at

the border between Turkey and Persia, complicit

the actions of the "Muzaffari"; and if the Turkish author

an explanation, he has none to give. He also reiterated what he

withdrawing the patrols, and wished His Majesty's Minister to

might take any action, if advisable

In the event of his withdrawing the patrols

likelihood of a recurrence of piracy in the

ference with the tribesmen, in the absence of the Sardar Arfa's men,

to trouble

(C. 10. 10. 1904)

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

September 16, 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

10. 10. 1904

On September 13, 1904. The Customs steamer "Muzaffari" arrived from
mouth of the river with two native boats (bun) in tow, which she had
out of having arms on board. She belongs to Koweh, and had twenty
and ammunition concealed in the vessel, and the other, which is

"Muzaffari" left during the night for the mouth of
The two boats are under detention pending

Director-General of Customs on board accompanied by the Persian revenue steamer
"Muzaffari" returned to Bushire. They brought with them

by the "M. 12" after

The two vessels returned. The Koweit dhow captured with twenty-eight rifles on board entry No. 13 in my diary (dated the 24th September, 1904).

It is reported that another Koweit dhow was seized with ten rifles on board, but was

Inclosure 22 in No. 26.

Captain Knox to Major Cox

Koweit, September 14, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a copy (with translation) of a letter received from Sheikh Mubarak, in which he complains of acts of interference with Koweit vessels on the part of the Administration of Persia.

2. I have not had time to verify the allegations, as it is yesterday, and Sheikh Mubarak is anxious that you should be acquainted with his

of a dhow which is under British protection.

is Department that the Arab Nakhoda is in the wrong, and must prove his innocence. I will instance the case of an Arab named Mubarak-Khaifa

from Sharjah, where he had already been taken from his boat, and he was told to wait and prove his

and put out to sea. The Belgians have detained him and some of his crew pending

but for this last heinous offence he is to be persecuted in every Persian port in which he dares to show his face. They have caught him once already, and attached a small boat of his, but could not manage to detain the man himself, who is now in Koweit.

7. It is perhaps unnecessary to call to your remembrance the case, on your office records, of the Koweit boat which, it is alleged, was searched unsuccessfully for arms in the open sea, and then towed to the Persian coast, where it was fined for a technical breach of the Customs Regulations.

that Arab Nakhodas are bound to prove that the Customs Department can have only been

BOAT

2.
3.

The whole subject is under the close and anxious attention of Sheikh Mubarak and myself, and I hope at leisure to submit more fully matured proposals for the solution of the various questions involved therein.

Sheikh Mubarak-us-Sabah to Captain Knox

(Translation.)

crusading from the buoy to Qasbah within the Shant-el-Arab, and seized vessels

Every boat carries a small gun for salute purposes on return to their country and is manned by a few soldiers. Now they have posted soldiers in her, and taken her small-arms, to the number of twelve, and delayed the boat.

And now a letter from the Nakhoda of the boat has reached us, saying that they had been taken at the buoy, and that the boat was kept in custody with him. And may you remain vigilant!

(Telegraphic.)

October 3, 1904
September, regarding Persian

boat stopping and searching vessels bound for Persia, and that he has telegraphed to the Minister of the Interior on the subject.

(Addressed to His Britannic Majesty's Minister, Tehran, and repeated to the Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department.)

Inclosure 25 in No. 26.

(Captain Trevor to Government of India.

Bushire, October 1, 1904

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith, for the information of the Government of India, a copy of a letter dated the 23rd September, 1904, from His Majesty's Consul at Muhammerrah, on the subject of the proceedings of the Persian revenue steamer "Muzafferi" in the Shat-el-Arab.

2. In reply to a reference from me, M. Waffelaert, Director General of Customs, states that the "Muzafferi" did, in fact, capture two Koweit dhows, one of which was released on payment (under protest) of a fine of 8,000 krans, and the other of which was brought into Bushire, to be detained till a fine of 15,000 krans is paid. M. Waffelaert added that it was not in his power to discuss the matter further at Bushire, as a report of the capture had already been dispatched to Tehran, presumably from Muhammerrah.

3. The position of British Consular officers in Persia with regard to Koweit subjects is at present so undefined that, in view of M. Waffelaert's attitude, it seems unlikely that very much will be effected here.

4. A copy of this communication, with its inclosure, has been sent to His Majesty's Minister, Tehran.

Inclosure 26 in No. 26.

(Consul McDowell to Major Cox

Mohammerrah, September 28, 1904

WITH regard to the seizure of native craft by Customs steam-ship "Muzafferi," I have the honour to report that the owner of a Koweit dhow made a complaint to His Majesty's Consul at Muhammerrah who sent him to me. I have no instructions as to whether Koweit subjects are entitled to more than good offices, and inquired from the Customs authorities if they would accept my intervention on behalf of Koweit subjects.

M. Waffelaert, Acting Director General, Bushire, informed me that at Bushire, as he had no orders from Tehran to recognize the right of His Majesty's Consulate-General to take any action of the Consulate-General should be unofficial, and suggested that the same should be done here, to which I agreed.

M. Waffelaert said that, as it would take some time to settle the case, and reference would have to be made to Tehran to avoid delay to the vessels, he was prepared to accept payment of a fine under protest, the fine to be twice the value of the rifles, estimated at 30 tomans each, and the vessels could then be liberated; when the case had been settled and the amount of fine fixed, if anything to be returned to the owner it would be returned.

The owner of dhow accepted this on my advice, and has received a receipt stating that the amount was paid under protest.

The owners are Abdullah-bin-Muhammad and Alwan-bin-Hossein, who state that they bought the vessel two years ago from Abdul Aziz Agha, in whose name the register was issued by Sheikh Mubarak.

The vessel is the dhow "Teyser," Nakhoda Ali-bin-Muhammad Mubarak. She was bound from Koweit for Sabihyat, near Bussorah, to load dates.

The cause for the vessel is that they carried 12 rifles and 1,200 cartridges for the defence of the vessel and did not conceal that they had these rifles on board; that they were bound for Sabihyat in Turkish territory, where their owner is awaiting them, and had no intention of communicating with Persian territory; that the river being the border they were not in Persian waters; that as they were to load dates for sale at the Bedoun villages between Ras-el-Had and Partag and on, they had brought these arms for protection.

The Customs case is that the rifles were concealed and were new with the full complement of cartridges; that as the importation of arms is prohibited in Turkey as well as Persia it is of no importance where they were bound. If the vessel can prove that the rifles were not for sale, I am of opinion that twelve rifles are not an

excessive amount, as pirates often occur off the mouth of the Shat-el-Arab, and all vessels therefore should carry sufficient arms to protect themselves, and the Bedoun coast is also unsafe.

A second dhow, Nakhoda Ghanim, is also understood to belong to Koweit. She was captured by the "Muzafferi" and the fact is not stated. She was carrying bundles of hides consigned to Bussorah to which port she was bound. She was captured in Persian waters, but not within Persian jurisdiction. This vessel had been taken to Bushire as the owner cannot pay a fine. The fine demanded would come to more than the value of the vessel, and the owner's entire capital was invested in these rifles and the vessel which is mortgaged already.

I enclose herewith the deposition of the Nakhoda and, if necessary, he will swear an affidavit in these terms.

The owner states he can get evidence at Koweit that the rifles were purchased for the defence of the vessel only.

If the presence of the owner, Nakhoda, and others is necessary in Bushire to support or prove their claim for a refund of the fine and return of the arms, I would beg to be informed as soon as possible.

Inclosure 27 in No. 26.

Deposition of Ali-bin-Muhammad Mubarak, Nakhoda of the dhow "Teyser" of Koweit.

I, ALI-BIN-MUHAMMAD, Nakhoda of the dhow "Teyser," state as follows:—
The vessel left Koweit for Sabihyat to load. On the 10th September 1904, we were captured by the Customs steam-ship "Muzafferi" and taken to Bushire. We were bound for Sabihyat, near Bussorah, to load dates. We were carrying 12 rifles and 1,200 cartridges for the defence of the vessel. We were not in Persian waters, and had no intention of communicating with Persian territory. We were to load dates for sale at the Bedoun villages between Ras-el-Had and Partag and on, they had brought these arms for protection.

I solemnly declare, and am prepared to take oath, that the above statement is true in every particular.

(Seal of Ali-bin-Muhammad.)

Deposed and sealed by the said Ali-bin-Muhammad at Mohammerrah this 23rd day of September, 1904.

Before me,
(Signed) W. McDOWELL,
His Britannic Majesty's Consul

Inclosure 28 in No. 26.

(Captain Trevor to Government of India

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, October 10, 1904

I refer to my telegram of the 27th September and letter dated the 1st October. I have been informed that the Nakhoda of the dhow "Teyser" has been released on payment of a fine of 15,000 krans. I have requested the Customs authorities to inform me of the result of their proceedings. The Customs authorities do not concern the Governor, and that I should apply to the Customs Department. I had already written semi-officially on the subject to the Director-General without eliciting a reply from him. I would suggest that the British

Fao creek. I don't know how many Belgians there were. They were in a jolly-boat belonging to the "Muzaffer." There were perhaps eight men, and among them was one Belgian, at least he appeared to be a Christian. The others were Persians and Mahomedans. They fired at us four times from about 200 yards away. No damage was done. They did not hit the boat. We knew it was ball cartridge from the noise of the bullets. We went straight off and returned to Koweit.

N.B.—This man was extraordinarily frightened, and I am afraid that the fear of being led off to instant execution afterwards made him confess to what he said.—S. G. K.

Dated Koweit, the 25th September 1904.

STATEMENT No. 3

About ten or twelve days ago, I left Koweit in the boom "Musallini," property of Sheikh Mubarek. We left at night for Fao. We saw the Belgians at Gushah. There were six men in the jolly-boat. The jolly-boat was coming off from the direction of Fao. The jolly-boat was from the man-of-war at Gushah. They fired at us four times. They were about 100 yards away or more. They shot ball, but did us no harm. They hit nothing at all in the boat. The boom stopped, and we all said, "This is the boom of Sheikh Mubarek. It takes the post to Fao." They said, "We searched the boom and found nothing. When they found nothing they went off to Gushah, and we went to Fao and anchored by the Sheikh's house. This all happened in the afternoon, and we were kept waiting from the afternoon until the evening over this business. Of the six men in the boat, one was a Belgian and the rest were Persians.

Dated Koweit, the 25th September, 1904.

STATEMENT No. 4

Ten days ago, I left Koweit in the boom named "Musallini," property of Sheikh Mubarek. We left Koweit at night for Fao. We reached Fao about mid-day. On the way we met the jolly-boat of the Belgians in front of Fao at the head of the creek. They fired at us four times. We were none of us killed or wounded. They fired at about 25 paces distance. They did not hit the boat, but they hit the sail. There were six men in the jolly-boat. They were all of the same colour. They were none of them Persians, but all Belgians. I did not say anything, but the other men in the boom said, "This is the boom of Sheikh Mubarek. There are no arms in it." The Belgians said, "We do not know Sheikh Mubarek. We have to search for arms." They spoke to us in Arabic. Our boom stopped, and the Belgians got in and lighted a candle and went through the cabin and hunted all over, they found nothing. They went off, and another jolly-boat came and opened the Nakhoda's box and found nothing in it. There were seven men in the second jolly-boat. They searched among the sail and among the bundles of date wood and found nothing. The second jolly-boat went off to the man-of-war, the small one, belonging to the Persians. We went off and anchored in the head of the creek. We were delayed about an hour.

Dated Koweit, the 26th September

(Signed)

S. G. KNOX, Captain,
Political Agent, Koweit

Inclosure 31 in No. 26.

Captain Knox to Major Cox

Koweit, September 27, 1904

IN continuation of previous correspondence, and especially with reference to my letter, dated the 18th September,* to your address, I have the honour to inform you that in translation of a letter received from Sheikh Mubarek in which he complains that vessels belonging to Koweit subjects have been seized by the servants of the Customs of Persia in the Shat-el-Arab. I have since heard that one of the vessels has been released after the payment of a fine of 1000, and the confiscation of the arms found thereon, and that the other boat has been taken to Bushire.

Inclosure 32 in No. 26.

Sheikh Mubarak-us-Sabah to Captain Knox.

5th Rajab, 1322 (September 16, 1904).

THE ships of our subjects of Koweit who have been taken to Bushire, and the crew and passengers have been done for the past three years for self-protection from pirates, who are numerous in Bushire; and the officials of the Persian Government have prevented them because of the necessity, for the object of the people of the ships is the protection of themselves and their property.

And now the Persian ship, in which are the Belgians, has occupied the Shatt between the buoy and Fao and has seized two vessels belonging to our subjects of Koweit and with them their arms, which were only in case of need; they have annoyed them to the utmost, and have seized the weapons and taken the boats to Mohammerah, and now news has reached us that they will also take the aforesaid boats to Bushire.

It is contrary to the rules of the Government of the Persian Empire, and it is a violation of our subjects, the people of Koweit, that you will not acquiesce in the seizure of their property. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
Sheikh Mubarak-us-Sabah

Inclosure 33 in No. 26.

Captain Trevor to Government of India.

Bushire, October 25, 1904.

MY letter regarding Koweit dhows Nakhoda still in confinement with local authorities. Director-General, Customs, has referred matter to Tehran, but has received no reply.

Inclosure 34 in No. 26.

Captain Trevor to Government of India.

Bushire, November 11, 1904.

KOWEIT dhows
The Customs Department are endeavouring to induce Nakhoda to execute deeds of gifts of dhows in favour of the Persian Government by the payment of a sum of 1000 rials. I have been approached on behalf of the Customs and Nakhoda

Inclosure 41 in No. 26.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Bushire, November 20, 1904

IN confirmation of my telegram of the 14th November, 1904, I have the honour to state, for the information of the Government of India, that the Director-General of Customs has informed me that the Koweit (now belonging to Abdul Aziz-bin-Farah of Koweit, which has been detained here will now be confiscated. Instructions have been issued by the Central Customs Administration that the Nakhoda of the dhow is to be imprisoned until the fine of 18,000 krans is paid, or until further orders.

2. I submit that this is an exceedingly high-handed proceeding, as there was absolutely no evidence brought forward at the investigation at Mohammerah (vide Mr. Consul McDonnell's Report sent with my letter, dated the 1st October, 1904) to show that the rifles were intended for Persia.

3. M. Waffelsort also declares that "all articles on board" will also be confiscated under Article 5 of the Act of the 5th Ruzman 1317. I have pointed out that only articles used to conceal the contraband goods should be confiscated, but M. Waffelsort does not agree, and the question has been referred to Tehran. There were on board the dhow four boxes of canvas belonging to one Hajj Mukhlis, of Bahrein, consigned by him to Sulaiman-bin-Mahmud-el-Thakur, of Bussorah, and it was in connection with a request made by me that Hajj Mukhlis's canvas should be returned, that the question of Article 5 of the Act of the 5th Ruzman came up.

No. 27

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 14.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 13th January, relative to the Aden delimitation.

India Office, January 14, 1905

Inclosure in No. 27.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick

January 13, 1905

(Telegraphic.) P.

ADEN delimitation: Your telegrams of the 3rd and 7th instant.

Position is obscure, and we await details which may throw light upon it. Meanwhile, in the absence of information as to the manner in which the Turks propose to draw the line from Mudariba to Kuddam, we are not in a position to express an opinion. With regard, however, to the Turkish proposal that British troops are to be debarred from entering the Nine Cantons, this could not be made admissible by any other on their part to give us a claim in respect of the Zubairi border. As now demarcated, the Nine Cantons become virtually British territory.

(Repeated to Mr. Pittman)

No. 28

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 15.)

(No. 14.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

MESSRS. Lorimer and Gabriel's journey.

With reference to my despatch No. 22 of the 10th instant, His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad informs me by telegraph that Turkish authorities, having allowed these gentlemen to start for Nedjef, have now issued orders to stop them.

I have been informed by the Sublime Porte, in answer to representations which I made on the subject, that they can go to Kerbela (which they might possibly do via

Hilah and Nedjef). Porte have heard from Vah of Bussorah that they intend to go to Nedjef, and have been informed that the Sublime Porte have issued orders to stop them.

Shall I press for them to be allowed to go to Nedjef? I think it would be unreasonable and impudent to insist on their being given permission to go to Nedjef under existing circumstances.

I have telegraphed to Major Newmarch to inquire what is the real destination of these officers.

No. 29

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 16.)

Constantinople, January 10, 1905.
I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 7th instant, and to inform you that the Sublime Porte have issued orders to stop the journey of Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel to Nedjef.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY

Inclosure in No. 30.

Consul Richards to Mr. Townley

(No. 30.)

Sir

Damascus, December 24, 1904

I HAVE the honour to report that, according to information received from the Consul at Hama, Syria and Salomon are both mentioned, in view of other districts in this "Oud u" district, will very shortly be passing through Damascus on their way to Mecca in the Yemen, which is said to be their ultimate destination. I understand that the Consul at Hama is at present unable to give any further information.

I cannot at present guarantee the truth of the above, but I believe it to be based on fact. Any further development I shall not fail to report, if necessary, by telegraph.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. S. RICHARDS

No. 30.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 16.)

(No. 22.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 10, 1905

ABOUT a month ago I received a request from the Government of India to procure the necessary permission for two officials of the Government, Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel, to travel in the vilayets of Bussorah and Bagdad for the purpose of investigating the situation of the Nine Cantons.

I was doubtful from the first as to whether the Sublime Porte would grant the necessary permission, and I have now been informed that the Vah of Bussorah had ascertained that the real object of the two

officers, who had already been carrying on suspicious operations in the neighbourhood of Kuwait, was to visit Ibn Saud and encourage him in his resistance to the Turkish troops.

Mr Lamb very properly at once categorically denied that Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel's journey had any such object, and pointed out that His Majesty's Embassy had not failed to inform the Sublime Porte of their approaching visit, and had requested the necessary permits to enable them to carry out their mission.

Yesterday spoke to the Grand Vizier with some warmth on this subject, and reminded his Highness that it was hardly a friendly act to accuse a friendly Power of sending an expedition to support a rebellion against the Imperial Government. I said that it was ridiculous to suppose that His Majesty's Government would employ officers for such a purpose, or that it would be worth their while to foster intrigues against the Turkish Government, but that it was little short of insulting to accuse us of such an intention with officers whose approaching visit had been politely notified to the Porte beforehand.

Ferid Pasha tried to excuse himself by saying that he did not connect Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel with the officers whose presence had been reported from Huesorah, that foreign Consuls were responsible for the suspicions which had been raised, and that now that the Embassy had explained the real object of their visit there was no more to be said, and the Sultan would be fully satisfied.

I pointed out to his Highness that the complaint made to Mr Lamb was based upon a report made by the Van of Bussorah on the strength of information received from his secret agents at Kuwait, and that the impropriety on the part of the Sultan's Government in harbouring such suspicions of the acts of a friendly Power still remained. I added that the best way to prove that our good faith was not doubted, was to issue the permissions asked for without further delay.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY

Inclosure in No. 30

Memorandum by Mr Lamb.

HIS Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to-day communicated to me a Vizierial letter, dated the 21st (3rd) instant, from Moukhlis Pasha, the Commandant and Van of Bussorah, in which he states that the secret agent dispatched by him to Kuwait for the purpose of inquiring into the doings of the Englishmen, who had been displaying flags in and about that town, had returned to Bussorah. This agent's report fully corroborated the statements made in his previous telegrams of the 15th (24th), 17th (30th), and 18th (1st), respectively, viz., that the object of these Englishmen was principally to send emissaries to Ibn Saud to incite him to still further develop and extend the scope of his ambitious designs against the Imperial Government.

The Vizierial letter went on to say that these and other nefarious proceedings of the Englishmen demand attention, and directed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to make representations to the British Embassy with a view to causing a stop to be put to them.

I caused an answer to be returned to this communication to the effect that His Majesty's Embassy did not consider it proper to take part in a discussion of the policy of English officials inciting Ibn Saud against the Imperial Government was too absurd for discussion, and that the officials who had recently visited Kuwait were no doubt Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel, who had no political mission whatever, but were simply charged with the collection of statistics for the purpose of publishing the Gazetteer, as His Majesty's Embassy had not failed to inform the Porte in due season, when it gave notice of their intended voyage, and solicited facilities for their visit to the vilayets of Bussorah and Bagdad.

(Signed)

HARRY H. LAMB

January 5, 1906

Enclosure to the Marquess of Londonderry, Received January 5, 1906

Constantinople, January 10, 1906

I refer to my despatch No. 7 of the 9th instant concerning the trouble in the Yemen.

A report has been current here during the last few days that the Turkish Government has been irritated at the publicity given to the story. They express themselves as being annoyed that the reinforcements which have already reached Hadramah will prove sufficient to stem the tide of rebellion and relieve the military posts at present invested, and that, upon the arrival of the additional troops, whose departure for the Yemen has been reported to your Lordship from time to time, order will be speedily restored.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY

Inclosure in No. 31

Lieut. Consul Richardson to Consul Deery

(No. 105)

Sir

Aden, December 20, 1905

HIS Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires telegraphed to me this morning that the state of affairs in the Yemen is becoming more and more serious.

We were learnt that the Arab risings throughout the Yemen are becoming more and more serious.

The Van of Bussorah has been informed that the preparations are being made to organize a general revolt throughout the mountainous districts of the Yemen, where the natives are very numerous.

A few of the principal Arab traders and a certain Italian merchant, all of whom I used to meet at the capital, appeared to be having in a stock of provisions the was anticipated that the town would be threatened if not actually besieged.

It has been entirely cut off, and telegrams can but with great difficulty be got through by other circuitous routes.

The caravan tract between Menakha, the next garrisoned town in the mountains, situated about 55 miles directly north-east of Hadramah and 75 miles by the usual road, and Suk-el-Khaima, a village built on a narrow mountain ridge.

The heights running in parallel lines between the two above-mentioned towns are now being traversed by the rebels.

It was rumoured here that the insurgents had invested the town of Suk-el-Khaima.

The road further north-east of Suk-el-Khaima is a disturbed one.

It is not definitely known whether Sana'a has been besieged or not, but the interruption of the road between Menakha and Khaima has rendered it impossible for supplies to reach the large body of troops stationed there from the Hadramah side.

The mortality from starvation among the troops is supposed to be considerable. It is known to me that the Turkish commissariat keeps no reserve of provisions at Sana'a.

News that has been received from the Yemen is that the value of ordinary conditions would be from 10 to 15 dollars (one Maria Theresa dollar is equivalent to 1s. 10d.). The charge for a

bag of flour, weighing $1\frac{1}{2}$ cwt., has risen to 50 dollars against the usual rate of 10 dollars.

I am also informed that the Hashid and Bekil tribes inhabiting the country north of Sana'a have risen, and are giving trouble at Haje and Hujur.

There is no doubt that the Arabs in the vicinity of Sana'a have seized their long watched for opportunity of participating in a revolt against the Turks.

The Mutessari of Hodeidah has left for Bajl accompanied by a few sheikhs from the Tehana to await the arrival there of 2,000 armed Arabs from the plain, whom the above sheikhs have pledged themselves to raise to assist the authorities to force a passage through to Sana'a with provisions for the starving garrison.

Reinforcements are being sent from Assyr; two battalions of Redifs stationed there are being transported to Lohela, whence they will march in the direction of Menakha.

Fresh drafts from Constantinople are daily expected to arrive at Cumfida and Hodeidah.

Syyed Ahmed-en-Sherai Pascha, the President of the local municipality, the most influential resident of Hodeidah, is raising a native force of 600 men. Military authorities are arming and forming into a "Hameedia" corps, which, on completion, will be utilized against the insurgents in the mountains.

I have, &c.

(Signed) G. A. RICHARDSON

No. 32

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 16.)

(No. 28.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 10, 1905.

WITH reference to previous correspondence respecting preparations for the Nejd expedition, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith copies of despatches from His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad respecting mobilization of troops and collection of camels at Mosul.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY

Inlosure 1 in No. 32.

Consul-General Newmarch to Mr. Townley

(No. 988/76.)

Sir,

Bagdad, December 2, 1904.

THE Consular Agent at Mosul reports as follows in one of his letters dated the 22nd November, 1904:—

"An order has lately been issued calling out the reserves of this vilayet. The 3rd Battalion has already been assembled from the 24th Firkas of the 47th Liva of the 93rd Alai.

"This mobilization is due to the alleged fights going on between Ibn Rashid and Ibn Salih, because the Turkish Government intends to assist Ibn Rashid by sending him soldiers."

I have, &c.

(Signed) L. S. NEWMARCH, Major

Inlosure 2 in No. 32.

Consul-General Newmarch to Mr. Townley

(No. 1010/78.)

Sir,

Bagdad, December 12, 1904.

IN continuation of my despatch No. 988/76 dated the 2nd instant, I have the honour to submit the following further report from the British Consular Agent at Mosul regarding the projected expedition against Ibn Saud:—

"I have the honour to inform you that some days ago an order was issued from the Grand Vizier at Constantinople to the Vais of Mosul to the effect that about 1,000

Christians, and Jews. The rest will be collected from the vilayet and from the immediate neighbourhood."

2. I hear that the Turks contemplate permanently garrisoning El Kasab. This is merely a pretext to cover their ulterior design.

I have, &c.

(Signed) L. S. NEWMARCH, Major.

No. 33

in Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 16.)

The Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and is happy to acknowledge the receipt of a letter from Mr. Fitzmaurice, dated the 15th January, relative to the Aden delimitation. India Office, January 16, 1905.

Inlosure in No. 33

Mr. Fitzmaurice to Mr. Townley.

January 10, 1905.
ADEN delimitation. I believe that instructions quoted by Turkish Ambassador to the Viceroy with a view to slight rectification about "line from Kadah" Comm. Repeated to Secretary of State and Foreign Secretary, Government of India.

No. 34

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 16.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and is happy to acknowledge the receipt of a letter from Mr. Fitzmaurice, dated the 15th January, relative to the Aden delimitation. India Office, January 16, 1905.

Inlosure in No. 34

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic) P

India Office, January 13, 1905.

ADEN delimitation. Please see the telegram of the 9th instant for

great waive their other Power.

(Repeated to Resident, Aden.)

(N
S r

[Faint, mostly illegible text block]

H. S. R. S. PACHA

observé conformément à l'entente in
l'invitation de son Gouvernement, prier le Marquis de Lan
munir le Consul Britannique à Bouchar d'instructions en conséquence

Ambassade Impériale de Turquie, Londres,
le 18 Janvier, 1905

(No 27
S r

Foreign Office, January 18, 1905

told me to-day that he had informed the Turkish
I had made to him on the 11th instant, Foreign
it was impossible for His Majesty's Government
precluded from sending troops

by part as one of serious importance, involv
ly to return, his
have be
clerk in in

I repeated that th
wholly unreasonable
which the front
absurd to suggest that we should be denied the p
mer to maintain order in the or even to prev
interfering with our possessions. What, I asked, was to happen supposing them to
be guilty of serious misconduct in the immediate neighbourhood of Aden? Was it
seriously claimed that in such a case we should have no right to punish them? I

9

ations the Turkish Government had
reasonable manner, and I begged his
us to tolerate the manner in which

(am. &c
signed) LANSLOWNE

[Faint, mostly illegible text block]

F. Bussacah to

111 in Department

from him
blized it

ded in
t would not be advisa
I visiting the disturbed

F. H. SAN JESIN

[Faint, mostly illegible text block]

Received January 1905

compliments to the l
action of Mr Secretary B
of St. J.

Muscet

January 18, 1905

Inclosure 1 in No. 27

Major to Governor

Bushra, July 30, 1904

the Government of I

on at the state of Z

h I can trace will be found in the corn
arn to Omm of Sheikh Hlal-bis A
er dated the 13th November, 1900, and

bera. issue with the Sultan
f the 5th instant, I am doubtf
t to follow the course suggested by the

1 No. 25 and 30

Political Agent. The Gov
the matter I do
shoot of the Sultan
between the two Princes

Major Cox
referred to
in the letter
coming for a special pro-

in the matter of
I have to be
not be helpful to our future policy

up your

supported by the Sultan in regard to
Captain Grey perhaps at
I for what?

in having the material at hand to enable me to quote figures, I think I
right in saying that during the past five years not less than 90 per cent of slaves
obtaining freedom at Muscat have been released with His Highness's concurrence, and
that in cases where manumission has been refused, there have been reasonable grounds
for that course. The Ruler of Muscat is placed in a very difficult position in regard to
slave question generally, as I think Government is aware, that as far as the British
readers are concerned, he has for many years been only content to
refuse them owing to the certainty of failing foul of the French flag in the attempt.

The information attached in Inclosure No. 2, recently received from the Political
Agent, shows, I think, that Seyyid

At the same time I quite
lever for pressure is required, the question of the Slave Trade is
too sound to furnish material for it.

Requesting that the views of the Government on the Zanzibar
question may be communicated to me in due course.

Inclosure 2 in No. 30

Consul-General Sinclair to Major Cox

Zanzibar, April 20, 1904

WITH reference to the correspondence ending with your despatch of the 10th
October last year, I have the honour to inform you that the Zanzibar Government
have since ascertained that the dhow which left Pemba and was suspected
of carrying slaves to Muscat was wrecked on the Italian coast between Ras Kler and Ras Hef
and that six of the slaves were sold to a Somali Chief named Samuntar Ali of H
el-Mulad. It is stated by a member of the crew named Hamis-bin-Su
to Mombasa and was there arrested, that the owner of the dhow, a Pemba Arab named
Saah-bin-Ah Bawal, accompanied by three other Arabs, Salim-bin-Ah-h Bawal,
Hawwedun bin-Shahb Hawnjir and Amier-bin-Said-bin-Hassan proceeded to
take up with them one slave girl, whom they refused to sell, in another dhow
they are still there. If this is the case, I would request you to be good enough to take
any steps that may be in your power to effect their arrest and return to Zanzibar. I
presume that subjects of the Sultan of Zanzibar when in the Oman dominions are under
the jurisdiction of the Sultan of Muscat in the same way that Oman subjects are, when

1

referred to the Sultan
I should be
Zanzibar's jurisdiction, but it has occurred to me as
aria as being natives of a British Protectorate and
me with your views on this point.

Inclosure 3 in No. 30

Major Cox to Captain Grey.

June 24, 1904.

ter dated the 20th April, 1904, from the
road brought to you from here last week
the concluding sentence of Consul-General Sinclair's communication.
I think that the question of our claiming, adversely to the Sultan
diction over Zanzibar subjects in Oman has hitherto ever been in issue, and so far
my knowledge goes, such persons, in the absence of any reasons to the contrary, have

3. The general question of the jurisdiction of the Sultan over Zanzibar subjects in Oman is a very important one, and a
reference to Government may be advisable. It is for this reason that I have taken it however, and
before any reply is sent to the part of Mr Sinclair's letter, I shall be glad if you will
let me have your views on the subject, after reference to your record.

4. It will be advisable not to discuss this point with the Sultan, and action is
better be taken in the present case through His Highness.

Inclosure 4 in No. 30

Captain Grey to Major Cox.

Muscat, July 5, 1904

I HAVE the honour to comply with the instructions contained in your letter
dated the 24th Jun

2. The question involved in this correspondence appears to have now come up for
the first time, and there is little or nothing which would assist me in
forming an opinion upon it. I cannot help thinking, however, that it would be better
all things considered, for us to claim jurisdiction over Zanzibaris in Oman. If, on the other
hand, as you observe, they have the jurisdiction of the local Government,

as you observe, they have the jurisdiction of the local Government, which is supported by the Sultan in regard
to the matter, and since, as far as I can see, it would be chiefly
sent instance—that jurisdiction over Zanzibaris would
have to be exercised, I am of opinion that we should take the present opportunity of
settling the matter as I suggest.

3. It is unlikely, I submit, that His Highness would raise any objection, and he
would probably be glad to be saved some extra trouble. Moreover perhaps if the
Zanzibaris knew that they were under our jurisdiction in Oman, and therefore more
likely to be caught and severely dealt with, it might help to keep them from having
to do with the people of the High Coast and

it would be some difficulty in deciding the status of such people in the
of their claiming the Sultan's protection as Arabs and not Zanzibaris (i.e., born
in Zanzibar), but arrangements for obtaining this might be made in common
with Mr Sinclair.

5. Paragraph 4 of your letter under reply is noted.

Inclosure 5 in No. 30

Consular Memorandum.

Name of Applicant. Shamloo-bin-Ibrahim, Baluch, aged about 11 years.

W. M. Some seven months ago was
kidnapped along with his brother while driving sheep to the grazing ground, and
I have been informed that he is now in the hands of the Sultan of Muscat.

R

man to Sohar and told him there to an Arab, by name Hamed, through Belal-bin-Hasan of Jask, who happened to be at Sohar at the time. Does not know the fate of his brother, who was kidnapped at the

Order: Gice Paper.

The Sultan has rescued this boy from slavery through his Wali of Sohar, and has sent him here.

(Signed) W. G. GREY.

Muscat, July 11, 1904

Inclosure 6 in No. 39.

Government of India to Major Cox.

Fort William, December 1, 1904

Sir,

IN reply to your letter dated the 30th July, 1904, I am directed to say that it is understood that the immediate point referred to for the orders of the Government of India is as to the powers of the Consul at Muscat to arrest and deliver to the native of that Protectorate who, after committing the offence of slave-trading, has taken refuge in Oman territory.

2. With regard to this point, I am to say that subjects of the Sultan of Oman are under the protection of His Majesty's Government, and that the provisions of "The Muscat Order in Council (1867)," relating to British subjects, apply to such persons. The provisions of the Order as to the authorisation of deportation to Bombay only, and in view of the fact that the Fugitive Offenders Act has not been declared to be in force in Oman, persons cannot be taken under that Act. The surrender and delivery of the persons in question to the authorities at Zanzibar can therefore only be effected by arrangement with the Sultan of Oman.

3. With reference to the general question of the status of Zanzibar subjects in Oman, I am to say that it is advisable, if possible, to avoid raising the matter, so long as there is no special occasion to do so.

I have, &c.
(Signed) L. RUSSELL.

No. 40.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 1905)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, in reply to a letter of Mr. Secretary Bredrick forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary, Calcutta, dated the 22nd December, relative to recent disorders at Bahrein.

India Office, January 18, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 40.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Bushire, December 12, 1904.

(Telegraphic.)

BAHREIN affairs.

In case of assault on German merchant, following settlement arrived at after much pressure. Fuller details by post:—

1. Four identified ringleaders publicly flogged in presence of complainant, and afterwards expelled.

63

2. 1,000 rupees deposited at Bahrein Agency as compensation to German; amount not yet disbursed, pending the approval of the Government of India.

3. Written undertaking from Sheikh of Bahrein to effect that Sheikh Ali and followers shall leave Bahrein within a week after my departure, and remain absent for three weeks in order to allow Government time to decide as to Sheikh Ali's future.

Inclosure 2 in No. 40

Major Cox to Government of India.

Bushire, December 12, 1904.

(Telegraphic.)

BAHREIN affairs

Have just returned from Bahrein.

In regard to second case, namely, injury to Shia subjects of the Shah of Persia by the British, I am in the highest degree my views with regard to the punishment of offenders. The case

will await full report by post, giving conclusions arrived at. Persian Government has left it to us to see justice done. Please ask Navy to keep "Redbreast" there in the meanwhile.

Inclosure 3 in No. 40.

Government of India to Rear-Admiral Atkinson-Weller

(Confidential.)

Sir,

Fort William, December 16, 1904.

WITH reference to the correspondence ending with your telegram dated the

on German and Persian subjects.

It is suggested that orders might be issued, directing His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" to remain at Bahrein for the present.

I have, &c.
(Signed) S. M. FRASER, Officiating Secretary.

No. 41

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 1905)

(No. 16.)

(Telegraphic.) P

Constantinople, January 19, 1905.

MESSRS. LORIMER and Gabriel's journey.

My telegram No. 14 of the 17th instant.

Myself has been abandoned

No. 42.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, January 20, 1905.

WE presume from your telegram No. 16 of yesterday that Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel have abandoned their visit to Nejd, as well as the one to Nedjeff.

No. 43.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 23.)N^o 40.

MESSRS. LORIMER and Gabriel

With reference to your Lordship's telegram
information from His Majesty's Consul General at Basra
going to Nejd

informing Turkish Government at Basra

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir H. Howard

(No. 6)

Sir,

AN Agreement was signed on the 15th October 1904, by myself and the French Ambassador at this Court, the arbitration of the Permanent Court of The Hague between His Majesty's Government and that of the French Republic in regard to Muscat. I transmit to you herewith a certified copy of the Agreement, and I request that you should transmit it to the Foreign Office, and to the Secretary of the International Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes signed at The Hague on the 29th July, 1899.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE

No. 45.

Indian Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 23.)N^o 41.

WITH reference to Mr. Villiers' letter of the 18th January on the subject of complaints regarding alleged proceedings of British officers in the Persian Gulf, and to Mr. Secretary Brodrick's letter of the 18th January enclosing papers received from the Government of Persia.

the Persian Gulf for the purpose of preparing a "Gazetteer". It does not appear from those papers that any visit to Nejd has been contemplated, and it appears from Mr. Townley's telegram No. 16 of the 19th instant, that the proposed visit to Nejd has been abandoned. Mr. Brodrick has, however, addressed a telegram to the Viceroy (copy inclosed) giving instructions that the proposed visit to El Hasa should not be carried out, and that the proceedings of the party elsewhere in Arabia should be confined to the neighbourhood of the coast. There appears to him to be no reason why further restrictions should be imposed in regard to the Peninsula of El Kahr and the territory of the Trucial Chiefs, where Turkish sovereignty has never been recognized by His Majesty's Government. But he will be glad to be informed whether the instructions given appear to Lord Lansdowne to be sufficient.

With reference to your letter of the 18th January forwarding an *au-dé-memoire* from the Turkish Embassy, dated the 28th December, as to the action of British functionaries at Kuwait, it will be observed that Mr. Brodrick has requested the Government of India to report the facts.

I am, &c.
(Signed) HORACE WALPOLE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 43.

Government of India to Sir N. O'Connor.^a

(Telegraphic.)

Simla, November 8, 1904.

MESSRS. LORIMER and Gabriel will visit Southern Persia and Turkish Arabia for a few weeks, next month or somewhat later, in order to collect information for the "Gazetteer of Persia." Kindly obtain for them all necessary facilities, and arrange for them to be allowed to carry arms as private, not official, travellers.

Repeated to Political Resident in the Persian Gulf and His Britannic Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad, for information.

Inclosure 2 in No. 45.

Government of India to Government of Bombay

Sir,

Simla, November 8, 1904.

I AM directed to forward herewith two passports for Mr J. G. Lorimer, C.I. and Lieutenant C. H. Gabriel, who are about to proceed to Persia and Turkey for the purpose of travel under the orders of the Government of India to collect information for the "Persian Gulf Gazetteer."

2. I am to request that you will be good enough to have the passports issued by the Persian and Turkish Consular authorities at Bombay, and returned to this office as soon as possible.

I have, &c.
(Signed) E. H. S. CLARKE

Inclosure 3 in No. 45.

Government of India to Major Newmarch

(Telegraphic.)

Simla, November 9, 1904.

IN continuation of my telegram dated 8th November, Lorimer and Gabriel wish to visit Hasa as private travellers. Can you obtain special permits from the Wali of Basorah, or do you advise the Foreign Office to apply direct to Constantinople for them?

Inclosure 4 in No. 45.

Mr. Townley to Government of India

(Telegraphic.)

Persia, November 9, 1904.

YOUR telegram November 8th, regarding visit of Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel to Turkish Arabia. Please give a list of the vilayets through which they propose to travel.

Inclosure 5 in No. 45.

Major Newmarch to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bagdad, November 10, 1904.

YOUR letter of 21st October and your telegram of 9th instant. No telegram dated 8th November has reached me. There is no objection to the proposed tour as far as district of Bagdad is concerned, but objections will probably be raised by Turks to the journey in Hasa. My friend Fakhr Pasha has been removed from Basorah. I therefore suggest that you should apply direct to Constantinople, or the journey should be made without permission.

^a Also to Mr. O'Connor.

Inclosure 6 in No. 45.

Government of India to Sir N. O'Connor.

(Telegraphic.)

Simla, November 11, 1904.

YOUR telegram dated 9th November. The vilayets of Bussorah and Bagdad will be visited by Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel.

Inclosure 7 in No. 45.

Government of India to Government of Bombay.

Sir,

Simla, November 15, 1904.

IN continuation of my letter dated 8th November, 1904, with which were forwarded passports for Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel to be used by the Persian and Turkish Consular authorities in Bombay. I am directed to state that the passports when completed may be forwarded to Mr. J. G. Lorimer, c/o Messrs. McIver, Mackenzie and Co., Kurrachee.

2. It is important that the passports should reach Kurrachee by the 23rd November at latest.

I have, &c.
(Signed) L. RUSSELL.

Inclosure 8 in No. 45.

Government of India to Major Newmarch.

(Telegraphic.)

Simla, November 15, 1904.

MY telegram dated 8th November, to His Britannic Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, repeated to you -

"Next month, or somewhat later, Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel will spend a few weeks visiting Turkish Arabia in order to collect information for the 'Gazetteer of Persia'. Kindly procure for them all necessary facilities for their journey, and arrange for them to be allowed to carry arms as private, not official travellers."

Inclosure 9 in No. 45.

Government of India to Sir N. O'Connor.

(Telegraphic.)

Simla, November 15, 1904.

IN continuation of my telegram of 11th November it is understood that Bussorah vilayet includes Hasea and Katuf.

Inclosure 10 in No. 45.

Government of Bombay to Government of India.

Sir,

Bombay Castle, November 23, 1904.

WITH reference to Mr. Russell's letter dated the 15th instant, I am directed to state, for the information of the Government of India, that the passports which accompanied Mr. Clarke's letter, dated 8th instant, were forwarded to Mr. Lorimer on the 10th instant duly used by the Persian and Turkish Consular authorities at Bombay.

I have, &c.
(Signed) G. H. A. HILL.

Inclosure 11 in No. 45.

Major Cox to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.)

Bushire, December 13, 1904.

Mr. LORIMER'S tour to Koweit will not further affect the situation there, as the 'Investigator' has just been surveying in and around Koweit both by sea and land. As the Sheikh himself was expected, I accordingly allowed him to proceed. When I was at Bussorah a few days ago, I was informed that the collection of camels for the Nejd transport was going on briskly.

Inclosure 12 in No. 45.

Projected Tour of Persian Gulf Gazetteer Staff, 1904-1905.

November 26 - Mr. Lorimer, Lieutenant Gabriel, and native surveyor leave Kurrachee.

November 29. - Touch at Muscat and discuss matters with Major Gray.

December 1. - Touch at Bandar Abbas, and communicate, if possible, with Assistant Political Agent.

December 4. - Touch at Fathrein and interview Captain Pradeaux.

December 5-7. - Halt at Bushire, and arrange various matters with the Resident, or, in his absence, with the First Assistant.

December 8. - Arrive Koweit, where Mr. Gaskin will be in readiness to receive the party. An excursion will be made, if possible, westwards. During the halt the surveyor will fix as many points as possible in different directions. Mr. Lorimer and Lieutenant Gabriel will then march by land to Bussorah to avoid quarantine and Custom-house delays, being joined by the British Consul from Bussorah if possible at Koweit itself or en route at some intermediate point. Mr. Gaskin will remain at Koweit till the return of the surveyor from the direction of Bussorah, when both of them will start for Bahrein, arriving there on the 30th December.

January 1-10. - Mr. Lorimer and Lieutenant Gabriel will visit Bagdad, Najaf,

and such other important points as may be practicable, returning to Bussorah on the 21st January. Meanwhile, Mr. Gaskin will be working at Bahrein, and the surveyor will begin a map of the island, but must join Lieutenant Lorimer at Mohammerah not later than the 20th January.

January 21. - Mr. Lorimer and Lieutenant Gabriel will leave Bussorah by land for some point in Khuzistan, where Lieutenant Lorimer with the surveyor will meet them by appointment. The party will tour in Khuzistan for about three weeks. Mr. Lorimer and Lieutenant Gabriel with the surveyor will reach Bushire either by land or by sea from Mohammerah about the 15th February.

February 16. - Mr. Lorimer and Lieutenant Gabriel with the surveyor will proceed to Bahrein, and complete the inquiries commenced by Mr. Gaskin. The surveyor will fix a map of the Bahrein Islands. Excursions will be made if possible to Hasea and Katuf.

March 1. - Mr. Lorimer and Lieutenant Gabriel will return to Bushire and make enquiries along the Persian coast from Bushire to Bandar Abbas. Mr. Gaskin, taking the surveyor with him, will proceed direct to the Trucial Chiefs' coast, and endeavour to arrange for an excursion through the unknown Bahi Yasa and Mammur surveyor, meanwhile, will do what he can towards mapping the error of the Trucial Chiefs' territory.

March 12. - Mr. Lorimer and Lieutenant Gabriel from Bandar Abbas and the surveyor will join Mr. Gaskin at Abu Dhabi, and make an excursion westwards, returning to Sharjah about the end of the month.

April 1. - The whole party will march across the Oman Peninsula from Sharjah via Malah to Shinas or Sohar, and proceed thence by sea to Muscat, touching at some points on the Bahrein coast.

April 12. - Reach Muscat and remain till the 20th.

April 21. - Start from Muscat for Mahol via Wadi Halfin, arriving about the 26th May.

May 9.—Return to Muscat by sea, calling at Sûr, and arriving at Muscat about the 15th May.

N.B. No assistance will be required from R.N. or R.L.M. vessels till the 1st March, but it is very desirable that a Government vessel should be available (1) from the 1st to the 12th March for the coasting journey from Bushire to Bander Abbas, and thence to Sharga and Abu Dhabi; (2) for the return from Abu Dhabi to Sharga about the 1st April; (3), from about the 5th to the 12th April for the voyage on to Muscat: in other words, this programme must be altered unless a Government vessel can be made available from the 1st to the 12th March, from the 1st to the 12th April, and from the 1st to the 15th May.

(Signed) J. G. LORIMER

October 14, 1904

No. 45

ment of In

January 21, 1905
of the 29th December

...ing papers regarding ...
Turkish Government have protested, both at Constantinople and here, regarding the movements of officers in Turkey, and understood that the party have abandoned their project. In such circumstances they had better give up the visit to El Hesa also; and

marks have been planted at points at a distance from Kuwait by certain British fanatics, who arrived at Kuwait with five vessels; that tribes near Um Kasa and Kuzaimie have been incited by these persons to submit to Sheikh Mubarak, and that the British flag has been hoisted by Mubarak over his palace. I shall be glad to be furnished with a report on the subject.

No. 46

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne (Received January 23)

(No. 23)

(Telegraphic) P

MESSRS. Lorimer and Gabriel's journey

See my telegram No. 20 of the 21st instant.

Constantinople, January 23, 1905.

treated practically as prisoners, being sent thence to Bagdad under escort of gendarmes with an officer. In view of this treatment, I have made strong remonstrances at the Porte, demanding reprimand of Valli.

facilities should be refused, His Majesty's Government will doubtless be much annoyed.

I shall to-morrow cause fresh representations to be made at the Palace, but, as El Hesa immediately adjoins Ibn Saud's country, I anticipate a refusal.

No. 47

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 24.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 23rd January, relative to Koweit and Nejd.

India Office, January 24, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 47.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic) P.

January 23, 1905.

POLITICAL RESIDENT in Persian Gulf telegraphs, on the 17th instant, as follows regarding affairs in Nejd and Koweit:—

"Report of to-day's date received from Knox states that arrival of Ibn Saud at or in the neighbourhood of Koweit, on his way to Safwan (where he is to meet the Vali of Bassorah) is now imminent. It is also stipulated that Mubarak shall be present, and the latter is making preparations to proceed to the rendezvous. Going with him, as a measure of precaution, a formidable escort 1,000 strong. This important event is significant, because expediency of extending British protection to Ibn Saud and Nejd has been repeatedly impressed upon Knox by Mubarak, who represents that such a measure, besides being earnestly desired by himself and his friends before mentioned, is one facing which there is no alternative but to allow the Turks admittance into Nejd. At the same time, in a separate communication, Mubarak stated that he considered he ought to be subsidized

the present opportunity is being utilized both by Mubarak and Ibn Saud to work on our feelings. Knox, however, has maintained a guarded and discreet attitude. No doubt the Turks will do their utmost at the forthcoming Conference to seduce Mubarak. Probability is that he will not waver, but I should be glad to be informed whether I may ask for His Majesty's ship 'Sphinx,' which is available, to proceed to Koweit until required at Bahrein. Knowledge that a British man-of-war is present at Koweit while the conference with the Vali is proceeding might serve to give confidence to Mubarak or else might prove a useful deterrent. I should also be glad to know whether the Government of India have any special instructions for Knox in case it should be found impossible for a meeting between him and Ibn Saud to be avoided. Meeting will not be sought by Knox."

I have authorized Resident to ask for dispatch of His Majesty's ship "Sphinx" to Koweit, as he proposes, and I have referred him to your telegram of the 30th December for his guidance. I have also given instructions that, unless, of course, Ibn Saud actually visits Koweit, no meeting or communication with him is to take place.

No. 48

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(Telegraphic) P.

Foreign Office, January 21, 1905.

visit of Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel to El Hesa (see your telegram No. 23) formed that it had better be abandoned, and the movements of the party confined to the coast.

When, as will probably happen, the Turkish Government refuse permission, you should, as a concession on our part, let the matter drop.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Chief Justice Fuller

Sir, Foreign Office, January 23, 1905.
 HIS Britannic Majesty's Government have heard with great satisfaction through the United States' Ambassador at this Court that you have kindly consented to accept the office of Arbitrator in the Arbitration agreed upon between the Government of His Majesty and that of the French Republic to determine certain disputed questions relating to Muscat.

I have accordingly the honour to convey to you the thanks of His Britannic Majesty's Government for your courtesy in the matter, and to inform you that you are hereby appointed to act in that capacity on their behalf.

A copy of the Agreement, signed on the 13th January, from which you will observe that the time within which the Tribunal is to assemble at The Hague will not be earlier than the 15th June—an arrangement which, it is hoped, will suit your convenience.

Copies of the Cases, the Counter Cases, and the Arguments will reach you in due course, as provided for in the Agreement.

I am, &c.
 (Signed) LANSDOWNE.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 25.)

(No. 26.)

(Telegraphic.) P

Constantinople, January 25, 1905

MR LORIMER'S journey

With reference to my telegram No. 23 of the 23rd instant, assurances have been given me that, as regards his journey to Kutif and the littoral, authorities will place no obstacles in his way; it is, however, requested that, as the country round Hama is disaffected, he will not go to that town.

I have informed His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad of the above.

*The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir P. Bertie.*Foreign Office, January 25, 1905.

I MADE to the French Ambassador to-day a suggestion to the following effect—
 Muscat Arbitration—

I observed that a difficulty would arise with regard to the delivery of the Cases to the Tribunal of Arbitration, owing to the fact that the Arbitrators appointed by the two Governments had not yet had time to choose an Umpire. The Tribunal would not, therefore, be fully constituted on the day fixed for the delivery of the Cases and it would not consequently be possible to carry out in their entirety the provisions of Article II of the Agreement of the 13th October. It was therefore suggested that each Party should communicate to the Permanent Bureau at The Hague, on or before the 1st February, four copies of its Case. Of these one would be retained for the use of the Bureau, one reserved for eventual communication to the Umpire when appointed, and the remaining two would be forwarded at once by the Bureau to Chief Justice Fuller and Mr. Savornin Lohman.

I am, &c.
 (Signed) LANSDOWNE.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir, Foreign Office, January 28, 1905.
 I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 21st January, relative to the journey of Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel Arabia and to inclose, for Mr. Secretary Brodrick's information, copies of telegraphic correspondence with His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires on the subject.*
 I am to express Lord Lansdowne's concurrence in the terms of Mr. Brodrick's telegram to the Government of India of the 21st instant.

I am, &c.
 (Signed) T. H. SANDERSON

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 30.)

(No. 51.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 24, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 18 of the 10th instant, I have the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Damascus, reporting the departure of further troops, ostensibly for the Yémén, and a record of recent events in the Nejd.

It is the first intimation that has reached me of Hail having fallen into the hands of Ibn Saud.

I have, &c.
 (Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 53

Consul Richards to Mr. Townley.

Sir,

Damascus, January 11, 1905.

I HAD the honour to report by telegraph on the 9th instant, with reference to my despatch No. 59 of the 24th ultimo, that up to that date some 2,500 troops, most of whom are last year's conscripts, had left Damascus by the Mecca railway for Ma'au, whence they would march to Akaba and embark there for some post in the Yémén, probably Hedendah.

Of these troops 1,500 men came from Beirut, 1,000 having been landed there for the purpose, while the remaining 500 (in round numbers) are said to be last year's conscripts. As to this, however, you will be better informed from another quarter. Of the remaining 1,000, about 500—mostly last year's conscripts—have come from the Aleppo district, while the rest (500) have been drawn from the district.

I hear that a lieutenant-general (Serik), a colonel (M.ralai), and a lieutenant-colonel (Caminacian), whose names so far are unknown, are now on their way here from Constantinople, in order to proceed to the Nejd with the object of forming a sort of advisory Committee to Abdul Aziz Ibn Reshid, the Emir of that country. These officers are, it is said, to be joined here by two others of the rank of Kol Agluasi (lieutenant-major), one of whom is a certain Ferid Bey belonging to the Staff here, while the other, whose name is Mustapha Effendi, is coming from Aleppo, where he holds a similar position. I am even given to understand that Ferid Pasha, who holds the 4th (Bagdad) Army District, will also proceed to Nejd (if indeed he has not already started) on a special mission to the Emir, but you will be better informed on this point from another quarter.

You will, Sir, doubtless have heard of the capture of Hail by Abdul Aziz Ibn So'oud, the Wahibi opponent of Ibn Reshid. A report has reached me to the effect that Ibn So'oud has made an earnest appeal to the Sultan to support his claim to the

* Nos. 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, and 46.

Emirship of the N. Ibn Reshid, who can only claim descent from the founder, so to speak, of the dynasty. It is open to question whether the Sultan could, as a matter of policy, even if he wished, cease to protect the present representative of the Ibn Reshid family.

In view of the conflict now going on in the Nejd, it has been supposed to be on their way to it. It is reported, it is true, that Yemen is the destination, but that would be stated in any case. It does not follow that it is true.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. S. RICHARDS

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 30.)

My Lord,
Constantinople, January 2.
I HAVE the honour to report that His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad has informed me by telegraph that Messrs. Lornier and Gabriel have returned to Bagdad via Hilla. Major Newmarch states that upon their arrival at the latter place, the Katmakum told them that he had received orders from Bagdad that they return thence direct with a strong escort, but that they were not permitted to do so. They had renounced the escort, and were not permitted to do so. It appears, moreover, that during the second night of their stay at Hilla, they were posted on the river where they were, and that they were executed under an officer. This they only was to travel down the river to Bagdad for the purpose of seeing the Viceroy of India. Major Newmarch has informed me that their journey had no reference to the military expedition, and I had given similar assurances at the Porte, as I have already reported.

pressed for time, he has instructed the British Vice-Consul at Kerbela to undertake the journey down the Euphrates.

He adds that Mr. Lornier considers that it is important for him to visit the Katif and Basra districts, through which the major part of the central Arabian trade passes to the coast. He has asked me to obtain assurances that he will not be molested.

I have to-day represented to the Porte in forcible language the impropriety of the manner in which three officials of the Indian Government have been treated by the Katmakum of Basra, and I have suggested that the Vali of Bagdad, by reprimanding, since the instructions issued by him, I pointed out that it would have been a serious offence to have treated the officials of a friendly Government like common malefactors at any time, but that the offence in this instance was aggravated by the fact that they had been specially recommended to the Sublime Porte by His Majesty's Embassy, who had given assurances that the object of their visit was purely inoffensive.

I told the Minister for Foreign Affairs that he was no doubt in possession of a report from Musurus Pasha of the answer which your Lordship had made to his remonstrances against the actions of Messrs. Lornier and Gabriel, which you were good enough to communicate to me in your despatch No. 12 of the 4th instant. I said that it was ridiculous to suppose for a moment that the Government of India would send officials on such a mission as that which the Turkish Government professed to believe had been entrusted to these gentlemen.

I then informed the Minister that Mr. Lornier and an assistant proposed to visit El Katif and El Hassa, and I requested His Excellency to give me an assurance that they would not be molested. I added that I felt convinced that His Majesty's Government would be seriously annoyed after what had happened if any obstacles were put in their way to prevent them from carrying out the Mission entrusted to them. The Minister

took note of my observations, and said that he would communicate them to the Grand Vizier.

I subsequently saw his Highness and spoke to him much in the same sense as I had already done to Tewfik Pasha. When I stated that Mr. Lornier wished to go to El Hassa, Ferid Pasha at once exclaimed "but that is the Nejd, and we have already said that he cannot go there."

I represented that the part of El Hassa which Mr. Lornier wished to visit was not the disturbed region, and I expressed a hope that no obstacles would be placed in the way of the execution of his Mission.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 30.)

(No. 53.)
My Lord,
Constantinople, January 24, 1905.
WITH reference to my despatch No. 972 of the 20th ultimo, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship, herewith, copies of two Memoranda by the British Vice-Consul at Jeddah, on the condition of affairs prevailing in the Nejd.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 54.

Memoranda by Vice-Consul Hussein respecting Affairs of Nejd

(1.)

ABOUT a fortnight ago a messenger arrived at Mecca with letters from Bin Saood to the Grand Sherref and the Vali of Hedjaz.

It is reported that Bin Saood wrote to the Grand Sherref that as his Highness is the recognized leader of the Arab tribes and their Sherikha, so he considered it necessary to make him the channel of all correspondence between him and the Sublime Porte or His Imperial Majesty the Sultan.

He goes on to say that he has no idea of revolting against the Turkish Government nor to disobey their orders; and as he is the lawful Ruler of Nejd, and he has defeated the usurper, Bin Rashid, he was willing to accept any reasonable terms. He also mentioned in this letter that he was sorry for having fought the Turkish troops in Nejd, but as they were helping his antagonist, Bin Rashid, he was obliged to do so. He also mentioned that the booty, including guns, rifles, belonging to the Turkish troops, taken in battle with Bin Rashid.

He also informed the Grand Sherref that at the request of his Highness he has written to the Bassama, who are in the Nejd, to testify to the kind treatment they have received at his hands. It is also reported that telegraphic correspondence had passed between the authorities at Mecca and Constantinople.

The messenger has returned to Nejd three days ago with sealed letters to Bin Saood, both from the Vali and the Grand Sherref, but the contents of these are not known.

(Signed) MOHAMMED HUSSEIN

January 3, 1905.

(Signed) MOHAMMED HUSSEIN.

PS.—It is also reported that Ahmed Faizi Pasha has left Bagdad with 10 battalions of infantry, about 1,200 cavalry, and 36 field and 6 heavy guns.

11

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January '30.)

(No. 67)

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 24, 1905

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad, transmitting a copy of his weekly Intelligence Report to the Government of India, dealing with the state of affairs in the Nejd, the visit of Sir William Wollcock, and other matters.

I have, &c.

(Signed) **WALTER TOWNLEY.**

Inclosure 1 in No. 55.

Colonel-General Newmarch to Mr Townley

21

9498

Hogdad, December 26, 1904.

I HAVE the honour to submit for your information a copy of my diary for the week ending the 20th instant sent to the Government of India by the Foreign Department.

I have, &c.

(Signed) L. S. NEWMARCH, Major.

Inclosure 2 in No. 55

Diary of Political Intelligence sent by Consul General Neumarch to Government of India.

December 20.—On the 20th December the late Vali of Bagdad paid me a long private visit. He is going to command the expedition which is being sent by the Turks into the region known as Kumm, and he told me that his total force will consist of about 7,000 men, of whom about half are coming from Medina and from Yen, and the rest from the Bagdad Vilayet. If these do not suffice, troops will, he said, be brought from the Vilayet of Adana. He said that, on hearing of this expedition, the Sultan had written to him to say that they wished to make peace at a very early date. He said he did not expect there would be any serious fighting, and that his force would be sufficient to do so. When I asked him how he would feed so large a force, he replied, in a most easy-going way, that he supposed they would live on biscuits or baked food; but he added that they might occasionally get a little bit of meat if they were very tired. He said, he said, was by no

means to barren as generally supposed. He said the place had some perennial streams coming from the Jabal Shammar, and that in the neighbourhood of these there was some, and might be much more, cultivation. Also, he said, there were several wells and oases in the neighbouring desert.

He was, and has always been, most friendly towards me as far as his limited powers and the suspicion of the Turks would allow. He stayed for a long time, and we parted in the most cordial manner.

December 22.—On the 22nd December, 1904, I paid a visit to the new Vah, accompanied by Sir William Willcocks, who presented to him a letter of introduction from the Minister of the Interior at Constantinople. The Vah promised to give Sir William Willcocks every assistance, and Sir William promised to tell the Vah on his return what he had seen.

Sir William Willecocks intends going for about ten days up to Samarra by the right bank of the Euphrates, and to return via the bed of the Nahrwan Canal to Bakuha and Haggad. He later proposes to go to Hillah to see the canals in that quarter.

Six hundred infantry (Redifs or reserves) left to-day by the Turkish steamer "Mosul" on their way down the river. It is said that 300 of these men are going to the Muntlik country, and 400 to be stationed at Basiorah. These troops have recently arrived from Mosul and Kirkook.

I have heard it said here that the Sultan is pressing on the construction of the Hadjaj Railway in order to secure a terminus at the head of the Gulf of Akaba, and that the ultimate terminus of the railway will be at Mocho.

This incursion may be worth notice in connection with the efforts now being made to strengthen the Turkish authority and position in Karam and Central Arabia.

December 28.—The Consular Agent at Yocul reports as follows:—

"On Sunday, 11th December, the Redifs (reserve troops) which have been collected from this Vilayet (Mount) left for Bagdad in four mtns. They are about 300 in number. It is said that about forty of them deserted the second day after their departure, because the Government had not supplied them with bedding and clothing in this winter. . . . Some say that these reserves are going to join the fight which is now going on between Ibn Saoud and Ibn Rashid; others say that they are going against the Sharif of Mecca, who has disobeyed the Government and destroyed the Hedjaz Railway, and that now the Government will have to overcome the Sharif."

No. 545.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 30.)

No. 621

My Lord,

Constantinople, January 24, 1903.

WITH reference to previous correspondence respecting Nejd hostilities, I have the honor to report that His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah informed me, by telegram, on the 22nd instant, that the Sheikh of Koweit had written a letter to the Vali of Bussorah, which was supposed to be on the subject of a proposed meeting of Ibn Saud's father, the Vali, and the Sheikh. On the 23rd instant, Mr. Manshap telegraphed that a messenger had just arrived with a letter from Ibn Saud's father, asking the Vali to meet him at Safwan, on the Koweit boundary. The Vali, who has telegraphed to the Consul for permission, will propose another place such as Fao, or somewhere nearer to Bussorah. Ibn Saud's father is presumably now in Koweit.

replied to my despatch No. 901 of the 28th November, Mr Monahan is now living like an Arab in the desert. He is confined in prison, but that it had not yet been carried out. The agent had already a room to himself.

I yesterday told the Grand Vizier that his promise that the Sheikh's agent should be better treated had not been carried out, and his Highness replied that his instructions probably not yet reached Bussorah.

I have, &c.

(Signed) **WALTER TOWSE**

No. 57

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 30.)

Sir,

India Office, January 28, 1905.

WITH reference to Mr Villiers' letter of the 29th August, 1904, I am directed by Mr Secretary Brodrick to invite the attention of the Marquess of Lansdowne to the telegram from the Viceroy of the 30th December making further proposals for the conclusion of a Protectorate Treaty with Sheikh Ahmed-bin-Thani, of El Kair.

2. A copy of the Agreement of 1848 with Sheikh Mahomed-bin-Sance, on the lines of which the Government of India now recommend that an Agreement should be made with Sheikh Ahmed, will be found in Antebson's "Treaties," vol. x, p. 139. That Agreement, it may be observed, was not renewed in 1842 when, after the death of Sheikh Mahomed, a request for its continuance received from his son, Sheikh Jassim, was refused by the Government of India on the ground that Sheikh Jassim's relations with the Turks were such as to render an Agreement with him inexpedient.

3. The Government of India submit their present proposal as the best alternative to the recommendation in their Secret letter of the 31st March, 1904, that an Agreement should be entered into with Sheikh Ahmed substantially resembling those of 1848 and 1842. They attach to this proposal the assurance that, in the attainment of the object they have in view that any Agreement that may be made should be public, and should not be subject to the reservations suggested by His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, to which special attention is called in Mr Villiers' letter of the 18th January.

4. So far as the matter can be regarded as a local one affecting only Indian interests in the Gulf, the balance of advantage seems to Mr. Brodrick, for the reasons given in the Viceroy's telegram, to lie on the side of concluding an Agreement with Sheikh Ahmed. But if this view is accepted, and it is held that there is sufficient urgency to justify the conclusion of an Agreement, the question remains whether it would be better to sanction an Agreement on the lines of those with the Trucial Chiefs as recommended in the Government of India's letter of the 31st March, 1904, or to effect a renewal of the Agreement entered into with Sheikh Ahmed's predecessor in 1848.

5. The form of the Treaty of 1848, which the Government of India propose to revise, has the disadvantage of not, on the face of it, excluding extraneous interference, though by providing for the reference of the Chief's quarrels to the Resident, it might be so amended as to do so. It will be seen that the Marquess of Lansdowne that this was the one object which, in Sir N. O'Connor's opinion, justified our negotiating for a Treaty at all.

6. On the other hand, the form of the Treaties with the Trucial Chiefs, while it effectually provides for the exclusion of all outside interference, involves the exclusion of Turkey as well as of other nations, and would, therefore, be more likely to be strongly opposed by the Porte, and, for this reason, Mr. Brodrick inclines to prefer the renewal of the old Treaty of 1848.

7. Mr. Brodrick, however, would not press the question of an Agreement, if, in Lord Lansdowne's opinion, our general relations with the Turkish Government make it distinctly undesirable to take such action at present.

It will be observed that the Viceroy asks that a reply to his proposals may be communicated by telegraph.

I am, &c
Signed) A. GODLEY

No. 58.

*Memorandum communicated by the French Embassy, January 30, 1905**Arbitrage de Mascate.—Dépôt des Mémoires*

LORD LANSDOWNE a proposé, le 25 Janvier, à M. Cambon que chaque Partie remit, le 1^{er} Février, au Bureau de La Haye quatre exemplaires de son Mémoire, l'un pour le Bureau, l'un pour chacun des Arbitres, et le quatrième pour être remis ultérieurement au sur-Arbitre.

77

Or d'après l'Article 1^{er} de l'Article 2 du Compromis, les Parties Contractantes ont communiqué de leurs Mémoires respectifs en même temps que les Arbitres. Le Marquis de Lansdowne a proposé, le 25 Janvier, à M. Cambon que chaque Partie remet, le 1^{er} Février, au Bureau de La Haye quatre exemplaires de son Mémoire, l'un pour le Bureau, l'un pour chacun des Arbitres, et le quatrième pour être remis ultérieurement au sur-Arbitre. Mais, si le Gouvernement Britannique conserve quelque scrupule à suivre la proposition du Marquis de Lansdowne, il est possible que le sur-Arbitre, d'après le Compromis, d'ajourner encore jusqu'à la nomination du sur-Arbitre la remise simultanée des Mémoires.

Il y aurait intérêt à ce que le Gouvernement Français fût informé d'urgence, en raison de la date, des vues du Marquis de Lansdowne à ce sujet.

Le 30 Janvier, 1905.

No. 59.

Memorandum for M. Cambon.—(Communicated to French Embassy, January 30, 1905.)

WITH reference to the Memorandum communicated by the French Embassy to the British Embassy on the 29th January, 1905, in relation to the provision as to the delivery of the two Cases to the Umpire in the Muscat Arbitration.

His Majesty's Government had not intended to suggest any delay in the exchange of the Cases between the two Governments, and copies of the British Case will be forwarded to His Majesty's Ambassador at Paris to-morrow for communication to the French Government on the following day.

No. 60

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received January 31.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 29th January, relative to the proposal for the exchange of the Persian Gulf in connection with the Persian Gulf Gazetteer.

India Office, January 30, 1905

Inclosure in No. 400

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick

(Telegraphic.) P.

January 29, 1905

YOUR telegram of the 21st instant. Lorimer's tour in Arabia. We have sent instructions that visit to Hissa is to be abandoned. Lorimer is to be sent to Hissa on the 1st April) to Shinas or Sohar, via Mahdheh. There was never any intention of visiting Nejd or the interior. I will reply separately regarding the other points referred to in your telegram.

78

No. 61.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received January 31)

No. 27)

Constantinople, January 31, 1905.

DISURBANES in Nejd
Expedition has started from Nediel under command of Feizi Pasha.

No. 62.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir H. Howard.

(No. 7.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 31, 1905.

I TRANSMIT to you herewith attested copies of an Agreement signed by the French Ambassador and myself on the 18th instant,* providing that the time specified in the previous Agreement of the 13th October, 1904 (forwarded to you in my despatch No. 4 of the 21st January), for the delivery of the cases in the Muscat Arbitration shall be extended from the 13th January to the 1st February.

I request that you will communicate this supplementary Agreement to the International Bureau, in accordance with Article XXII of The Hague Convention of the 20th July, 1899.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 63.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir H. Howard.

(No. 8.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 31, 1905.

ARTICLE XXIV of the International Convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes provides that, in cases where Powers are desirous of applying to the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague for the settlement of disputes, each Party shall notify to the International Bureau their decision, and the names of the Arbitrators.

I have therefore to request that you will make a formal notification to the International Bureau, in accordance with the Agreement of the 13th October, 1904, copy of which was forwarded to you in my despatch No. 4 of the 21st January, by which Great Britain and France determine to have recourse to the Tribunal for the decision of certain disputed questions in regard to Muscat.

You should add that His Majesty's Government have appointed the Honourable Melville Fuller, Chief Justice of the United States' Supreme Court, to act as Arbitrator on their behalf; the French Government, on their side, have appointed M. le Jonkhoeer de Savornin Lohman, a Member of the Second Chamber of the States General of the Netherlands.

Article 1 of the Agreement of the 13th October, 1904, provides that the two Arbitrators shall together choose an Umpire, and the appointment will be duly notified to the Bureau when made.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 64.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir H. Howard

(No. 9.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 31, 1905.

I TRANSMIT to you herewith four morocco bound copies of the Case on behalf of His Majesty's Government and of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat in the pending arbitration with the Government of the French Republic in regard to the grant of the French flag to Muscat dhows.

* Agreement, January 13, 1905

79

These copies should be communicated to the Permanent Bureau at The Hague on the 1st February. One copy of the Case is to be sent to the Bureau, two for transmission to the two Arbitrators, and the fourth for eventual communication to the Umpire when appointed.

A further copy of the Case is inclosed for your information.

The copies of the Case on behalf of His Majesty's Government and of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat in the pending arbitration with the Government of the French Republic in regard to the grant of the French flag to Muscat dhows, have, to save time, been forwarded to His Majesty's Ambassador at Paris for communication to the French Government.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 65.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir F. Bertie.

No. 61.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, January 31, 1905.

I TRANSMIT to you herewith four morocco bound copies of the Case on behalf of His Majesty's Government and of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat in the pending arbitration with the Government of the French Republic in regard to the grant of the French flag to Muscat dhows. Copies of the Brussels Act of 1890 intended to form Annexes to the Case are also inclosed: the copy of the Case, which is bound in morocco, contains in the volume itself a copy of the Brussels Act).

I request that you will communicate the documents to the French Government on behalf of His Majesty's Government.

A further copy of the Case is also inclosed for your Excellency's information.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 66.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 1.)

(No. 28.)

(Telegram)

Constantinople, February 1, 1905.

MILITARY Expedition to Yemen.

Turkish papers of this morning contain an identic communication to the effect that Relief Expedition, after having dispersed the rebels, reached Sanaa on the 20th January.

No. 67.

Sir F. Bertie to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 2.)

No. 39.)

My Lord,

Paris, February 1, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that I have this afternoon communicated to the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, through the Department of the Protocol, the five volumes of the Case on behalf of His Majesty's Government and of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat in the pending arbitration with the Government of the French Republic in regard to the grant of the French flag to Muscat dhows.

Your Lordship's despatch No. 61 of the 31st January. One of these volumes was a bound copy containing a copy of the Brussels Act of 1890. Separate copies of the Brussels Act were communicated with the Case.

I have, &c.
(Signed) FRANCOIS BERTIE.

No. 6b.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 2.)

WITH reference to this Office letter of the 12th ultimo, the Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 31st January, relative to the Muscat Commercial Treaty.

India Office, February 1, 1905

Inclosure in No. 6c

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India

(Telegraphic.) P.

TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS, LONDON.
FROM THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA, CALCUTTA.
RE: MUSCAT COMMERCIAL TREATY.
FOR INFORMATION OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE, COPY OF A TELEGRAM TO THE VICEROY, DATED THE 31ST JANUARY, 1905, IS HEREBY FORWARDED.

No. 69

Sir H. Howard to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 3.)

(No. 15.)

My Lord,

The Hague, February 2, 1905

WITH reference to your Lordship's despatches Nos. 7 and 8 of the 31st ultimo, I have the honour to report that I addressed a note yesterday to the Secretary-General of the International Bureau at The Hague, communicating an attested copy of the Agreement signed by the French Ambassador at London and your Lordship on the 13th ultimo, by which the time specified in the previous Agreement of the 13th October, 1904, for the delivery of the Cases in the Muscat Arbitration had been extended from the 13th January to the 1st February, 1905.

I also notified M. de Ruysseaux that in the said Arbitration His Majesty's Government had appointed the Honourable Melville Fuller, Chief Justice of the United States' Supreme Court, to act as Arbitrator on their behalf, and that the French Government, on their side, had appointed M. le Jonkheer de Savornin Lohman a member of the Second Chamber of the States-General of the Netherlands, and I added that the appointment of the Umpire, who, by the provisions of Article 1 of the Agreement of the 13th October, 1904, is to be chosen by the two Arbitrators together, would be duly notified to the International Bureau when made.

I have, &c.
(Signed) HENRY HOWARD

No. 70

Sir H. Howard to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 3.)

(No. 16.)

My Lord,

The Hague, February 2, 1905.

WITH reference to your Lordship's despatch No. 9 of the 31st ultimo, I have the honour to report that I communicated to the Secretary-General of the International Bureau at The Hague, yesterday afternoon, four copies of the Case on behalf of His Majesty's Government and of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat, in the pending Arbitration with the Government of the French Republic in regard to the grant of the French flag to Muscat dhows, and explained that one of these copies was intended for the use of the Bureau, two for transmission to the two Arbitrators, and the fourth for eventual communication to the Umpire when appointed.

In exchange, I received from M. de Ruysseaux five copies of the Case on behalf of the Government of France in the said Arbitration, which had been furnished to him by the French Minister at this Court, for transmission to His Majesty's Government, and which I have the honour to forward herewith.

I have, &c.
(Signed) HENRY HOWARD

No. 71

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 6.)

(No. 71—confidential)

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith a copy of a Memorandum by Mr. Lamb, enclosing translation of a telegram, in which Abdur Rahman, father of Abd ul Aziz ibn Saud, renews his assurances of submission and devotion to the Sultan.

The Memorandum with reference to Fakh Bey and to the policy which it is probable that he has been sent to carry out in Nejd were forwarded to your Lordship in Sir N. O'Connor's despatch No. 684 of the 26th August last, and the substance of Mr. Lamb's Memorandum No. 422 was contained in my despatch No. 2 of the 2nd January.

As I had the honour to inform your Lordship in my telegram No. 27 of to-day's date, the military expedition under Feizi Pasha has already started from Nedjef. The Grand Vizier himself told me so this morning.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY

Inclosure 1 in No. 71.

Memorandum by Mr. Lamb.

I HAVE been furnished with the annexed translation of a telegram received two days ago from Ibn Saud, in which he renews his assurances of submission and devotion to the Sultan.

I have also enclosed in the last paragraph about the Grand Vizier's telegram, which had started from Nedjef but the Grand Vizier's telegram further on (or rather I think, for he seems to have been recently in Nejd) a translation of whose accompanying my Memorandum No. 289 of the 24th August last, is about to be despatched again to Nejd, with the ostensible mission of attempting to reconcile the two rival Firms, but more probably to assist in carrying out the policy indicated in my Memorandum No. 422 of the 31st ultimo.

(Signed) H. H. LAMB

Constantinople, January 30, 1905

Inclosure 2 in No. 71

Translation of an Arabic Telegram dated January 15 (24), 1905, and signed "Abdur Rahman Saud ibn Saud"

MY humble Petition, to be laid, by the intermediary of the Council of Ministers before the throne of His Imperial Majesty our gracious Sovereign Commander of the Faithful, Caliph of the Prophet of the Lord of all the Worlds.—

I am one of the faithful servants of the Shadow of God, whose family from father to son has lavished its blood and treasure in the glorious service of the Caliphate. I have no thought or aspiration save that of meriting the approbation of my Sovereign. It is for me a most sacred obligation to contribute the Imperial taxes at their due and

1516

Y

proper reason, and to serve and assist the divinely-aided troops of the Shadow of God. They have been represented this week alone to the Caliph, making him appear a traitor and a coward.

private the produce of my farms and date plantations, not even hesitating to murder my tenants and collectors, and in order to conceal their own traitorous conduct in this respect they continue to augment their slanderous accusations against myself.

As for the schemes and intentions of Abdul Aziz, he runs the whole of Nejd and Irak. Therefore, to further these aims, he sends forth his emissaries to his various provinces, and presents to him, who is the Caliph, those faithful ones who are opposed to his aggressive schemes. These, however, will be one and all known to His Majesty.

I, together with Jassim-bin-Thaim, Kaimakam and Head of Kutr, openly represented my submission and obedience in our telegrams to His Majesty (10th January).

I neither follow the instigations of any foreigner, nor am I in any way connected with any foreigner. In fact, under the protection of His Imperial Majesty, I am a faithful agent or medium of foreigners in all these regions. The Kaimakam's representatives at the capital naturally strive to provoke the wrath of His Imperial Majesty against me, but His Majesty is the judge. He does not desire to persecute his most faithful servants.

If the coming Commission of Inquiry does not establish the truth of my assertions, I shall be ready to accept the consequences. Let the Imperial Justice decide.

No. 72

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Londondown.—(Received February 6.)

(No. 78)

My Lord

Constantinople, January 1

WITH reference to my despatch No. 62 of the 24th instant, I have the honour to inform you that the Agent's Agent is now confined in privileged quarters in the company of an officer.

Humorah, accompanied by an officer.

The Grand Vizier has therefore carried out his promise that the Agent's imprisonment should be made as pleasant as possible for him.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY

No. 73.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Londondown.—(Received February 6)

My Lord

WITH reference to my despatch No. 27 of the 10th January, respecting the disturbed state of the Yemen, I have the honour to transmit herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Hodeidah reporting movements of troops despatched to the scene of the revolt.

The reports that reach me show that the rebellious movement is still further developing, and in a most important position. The delay in the arrival of reinforcements, and the mutinous conduct of the Beddis who have reached Cumfada, have caused the question of arming native levies, such as the Yami tribes, to be raised again.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 73

Vice-Consul Richardson to Consul Deroy

(No. 8.)

Sir,

Cameran, January

I HAVE the honour to report the arrival at Hodeidah on the 4th instant of the Turkish transport "Askani" from Yembo with 1,251 soldiers for the Yemen, followed the next day by the hired transport "Munsh," of the Khedivial Mail Line port, conveying 1,170 troops.

These troops belong to the 13th and 64th Regiments respectively of the Division, detached for service owing to the serious state of revolt existing in the country.

They have since been despatched to the interior, with 2 big guns and 120 camel loads of provisions and military stores for the hard-pressed garrisons stationed between Hodeidah and the interior.

The "Askani" sailed again the same evening for Cumfada to bring two battalions of troops to Hodeidah, but returned here this morning empty owing to the refusal of these troops to embark. I hear that the men have in addition an account of detention for over a year in Aden without pay and with an insufficient supply of food.

A Turkish vessel "Cezir" also arrived from Cumfada on the 6th instant, on board a battalion of 400 Beddis who have likewise mutinied and decline to march to Zaidya via Bahf. These are at present quartered at the northern extremity of the island, under canvas.

I am, &c.
(Signed) G. A. RICHARDSON

No. 74

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 6)

Sir,

India Office, February 4, 1905

IN continuation of Sir H. Waddell's letter of the 17th October, 1901, and with reference to subsequent correspondence on the subject of the violation of the Amiri boundary by the Turks near Kataba, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to transmit, for Lord Londondown's consideration, a copy of a letter from the Government of India, stating the conclusions at which they have arrived after considering the full reports of the local officers.

It appears that, though the violation of the boundary was not so serious as it was at first supposed to be, yet the Turkish authorities did pursue certain persons into Amiri territory with a view to arresting them not for any crime, but because they had been seen on the border.

In the circumstances reported, Mr. Brodrick is of opinion that, if the Kaimakam has not been removed in accordance with the pledge reported in Mr. Townley's telegram No. 151 of the 22nd October, the question, so far as he is concerned, might, if His Majesty's Ambassador sees no reason to the contrary, be no further pressed.

Mr. Brodrick is also of opinion that, in the interests of the peace of the border, it is desirable to settle the present incident to obtain from the Turkish Government an understanding on the following points:

1. That all communications between the authorities on either side of the border, in regard to disputes in that part of the frontier, should for the present be made through the channel of the Political Officer at Djibala. Future arrangements of a permanent character can be considered when the Government of India reply to the Secretary of State's despatch, Secret, dated the 23rd September, 1901.

2. That additional pillars should be erected where required.

That the establishment of villages should not be allowed on either side of the border in such positions as to render it doubtful whether they are in Amiri or Turkish territory. An arrangement to this effect would apparently prevent the recurrence of such incidents as the present one, and Mr. Brodrick is doubtful of the necessity of demanding, as suggested by the Government of India, that the Turkish Government should allow migration from Turkish to Amiri territory to take place without hindrance.

As to the persons whose arrest was accompanied by this violation of Amiri territory, Mr. Brodrick is of opinion that, if the points enumerated in the preceding paragraph are conceded, it is unnecessary to ask for more than their release with permission to settle on whichever side of the frontier they may prefer, but that otherwise their preliminary surrender to the local British authorities should be demanded.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY

Inlosure in No. 74

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Secret.)

Sir,

Port William, December 29, 1904

WE have the honour to invite your attention to the correspondence ending with our telegram dated the 11th ultimo, relative to the violation of the Amiri border by the Turks.

2 A copy of the correspondence on the subject accompanies our letter, but, for the sake of convenience, we may here give a resume of the main facts.

On the 21st September last the Political Resident at Aden reported that, under the orders of the Kaimakam of Kataba, a body of Turks and Arabs surrounded a village, Mazoob Hobal-al-Khadar, on the night of the 11th September, and seized with their cattle and other property, six Turkish subjects who had been shown, a village on the Turkish side, to settle in Mazoob Hobal-al-Khadar, which they thought was in Amiri territory.

We may explain that Shakab is a Yabur, and with most of the Yabur villages left to the Turks. However, at the request, in order to give him a good deal of the cultivation of this village left on the British side of the line.

houses in British territory, but, owing to the fact that the boundary pillars in this neighbourhood are about two and a-half miles apart and the country is flat, they unfortunately made a mistake, and built them just on the Turkish side of the line. The action of the Kaimakam was taken in spite of Major Menzies, the P. at Dhala, having the previous day requested him not to do anything in the matter, but to represent it officially, when it would be inquired into and adjusted. Notwithstanding this friendly advice, the Turks not only proceeded against the village, but also against those who escaped immediate capture into Amiri hands.

As a result the British frontier was violated in the most serious manner, and as a result the British frontier was violated in the most serious manner.

Consequently, as his powers in matters concerning the British are limited, the Kaimakam stated to Major Menzies that the Amir of Dhala had ordered away the village in question from the Turkish village, but inquiries fail to show anything.

The fact that the Amir has been approached by the men for permission to his lands in consequence of the treatment they were receiving at the hands of the Turks and had consented, somewhat readily perhaps, because he had recently purchased additional land.

On consideration of these facts, we desire to submit to His Majesty's Government the following observations:

(a) We are in accord with his Excellency the Governor of Bombay in thinking that the present incident should be made use of to obtain from the Turkish Government an understanding that subjects of either side of the frontier shall be free to settle the other without let or hindrance and without the fear of such consequences as resulted in the present case, and we would point out the necessity, which appears to us to have been established by the incident, of recognizing the principle that negotiations in regard to border disputes between the authorities on the British and Turkish side of the boundary along the whole of the demarcated frontier of the Amiri hinterland shall, in the future, should occasion arise, be conducted through the channel of the Political Officer at Dhala.

(b) We observe from the telegram addressed on the 22nd October to the Marquis of Lansdowne by His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Constantinople that the Turkish Government had not a hope that the guilty Kaimakam of Kataba will be reprimanded.

and we presume that no further action is contemplated by His Majesty's Representative until a reasonable opportunity has been given to the Porte to act in accordance with their implied promise. We earnestly trust, however, that should the latter show signs

preliminary surrender to the British local authorities of the Turkish subjects who were

utilized with a view to bringing pressure on the Turkish Government, but we do not consider that it is necessary, if the Porte prove compliant on the points mentioned under (a) and (b), to insist on anything more than the mere release of the men and the

prefer. This last demand is perfectly reasonable, since the cultivable land belonging to the hamlet of Shakab lies on both sides of the boundary.

(d) The British and Turkish local authorities should be authorized to make concerted arrangements for regulating the settlement of villages within a half-mile of either side of the boundary and for the erection of intermediate pillars, between pillars 12 and 13, on the other part of the Amiri border where the nature of the country would make such action necessary.

We have, &c.
(Signed)

CLAUDE
KITCHEN
E. F. G.
J. R. LILLES
A. T. ARNOLD
D. N. H. H. H. H.
H. L. E. RICHARDS

No 75.

M. Cambon to the Marquis of Lansdowne. — (Received February 6.)

Ambassade de France, Londres,
le 6 Février, 1905

M. le Marquis,

En prenant connaissance du Mémoire Britannique relatif aux troubles de Mascate, que, pour se conformer aux stipulations du Compromis d'Arbitrage, votre Sérénité a bien voulu faire communiquer à M. Delouche.

Le Gouvernement Britannique et du Sultan

statuante, et qu'une déclaration dans le même sens figure à la fin de la protestation. Une telle rédaction aboutirait à faire du Gouvernement Britannique l'avocat et le tuteur du Sultan indépendant de Mascate: mon Gouvernement ne saurait se trouver dans l'impossibilité d'admettre une telle protestation. Le Sultan de Mascate n'a aucune qualité pour intervenir dans un litige qui concerne exclusivement l'interprétation de

Déclaration Franco-Anglaise du 10 Mars, 1902; il n'a point été Partie Contractante au Compromis d'Arbitrage du 13 Octobre, 1904. Chacun de ces deux actes, et il ne peut prendre aucune part, directe ou

indirecte, à la solution de ce litige.

Je suis, Monsieur le Marquis, avec toute ma haute estime, votre dévoué serviteur.

chargé par moi-même de déclarer à votre Sérénité que le Gouvernement de Mascate dans la dispute

Arbitral de La Haye

Veuillez, &c.
(Signé) PAUL CAMBON.

No 76

Sir A. Hardinge to the Marquis of Lansdowne. — (Received February 6.)

(No 11.)

(Telegraphic.) P

Tehran, February 6, 1905.

KIRWAN subjects in Persia Government of India's despatch of the 8th December 1904

Am I to make representations to the Persian Government in this sense? Russian

and Turkish, and perhaps German, Representatives here would doubtless persuade them not to comply with our desires, but I could always point out that retaliation might be

through Nejd or Jebel, it is to Persia's interest to remain on good terms with the Sheikh Mubarak.

I might get them to send an informal hint to their officials in the south to refrain from molesting Koweit subjects and dhows, but I think they would most likely stick at formally recognizing our protectorate over the place.

Mr Grant Duff has already been asked by the Customs Department as to what is the political status of Koweit subjects in Persia, but he evaded answering till he knew what your Lordship's views were on this somewhat delicate question.

Repeated to India,

No. 77.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley

(No. 41)

Sir,

Foreign Office, F.

THE continued refusal of the Turkish Government to settle the boundaries of the nine cantons in the Hinterland of Aden renders it necessary that the Sultan and his Ministers should be left in no doubt as to the determination of His Majesty's Government to insist on a solution in accordance with the promise made by His Imperial Majesty to the King of Arabia in September last.

It is well known to you and the Turkish Government, but it will be useful that I should briefly summarize them.

In the summer of last year the protracted labours of the Commission appointed by the two Governments had resulted in a satisfactory settlement of the greater part of the boundary line between the nine cantons. Only two portions remained unsettled, namely, the boundary of the tribe from Misfarah southward to the sea and the line from Lakmat-es-Shub northward to the desert.

In respect of both these portions of the frontier an agreement in principle has already been arrived at between the two Governments.

On the 11th August last, Sir N. O'Connor presented to the Sublime Porte a Memorandum containing proposals with a view of arriving at a friendly settlement of these two outstanding difficulties.

In the case of the Subah boundary, His Majesty's Government were prepared to cede to the Subah a considerable tract of territory to which that tribe had valid claims, on the sole condition that those claims should be reserved in case the territory should be ceded to any other Power.

Their proposal for the settlement of the boundary from Lakmat-es-Shub to the sea was limited to no more than a request that the Turkish Government should adhere to the Imperial Decree of the 13th February, 1903.

On the 23rd September, 1901, His Majesty's Ambassador, who was about to proceed on leave of absence, was received in audience by the Sultan, and His Imperial Majesty then promised that he would, on the following day, give his formal assent to the Aden frontier delimitation.

This promise was not carried out.

Sir N. O'Connor continued to press his departure from Constantinople, and during the ensuing fortnight repeatedly pressed the Sublime Porte for its fulfilment in the usual form of an Imperial Decree. These representations met with no result, and finally, on the 9th October, he presented a First Dragonman to the Porte to demand a categorical answer. Mr Lamb actually pronounced and would reach the

10th October.

On the 10th October you were informed at the Porte that the Irade had actually been received, and that it was favourable. Mr Lamb saw the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs the next day. He was not shown the text of the Imperial Irade, but was informed by Tewfik Pasha that it was perfectly satisfactory and in accordance with the terms of the Memorandum communicated by Sir N. O'Connor on the 11th August. Mr Lamb was further authorized to tell you that you could report to me in this sense.

Two days later, on the 13th October, you learned that the Irade had been recalled by the Palace, you were assured that it was a trifling matter, which would soon be set straight, and you were promised a further communication on the 20th October.

As the promise was not fulfilled, and His Majesty's Government decided to dispatch one of His Majesty's ships to watch over British interests on the Aden coast. On the 28th October the Turkish Ambassador called upon me, and assured me that the Turkish Government had no intention of breaking their promise. He stated that he was

to tell me that the Sultan's decision would be announced on the 30th October, and, in deference to his urgent request, I consented to give instructions to His Majesty's ship to the Aden coast should be suspended.

At the Sultan's decision was made to me on the promised date, but on the 4th November Musurus Pasha communicated to me proposals from the Turkish Government, which practically amounted to reopening the entire question. I expressed to his Excellency my surprise and regret at this departure from the scrupulous good faith which two friendly Powers should never fail to observe to one another.

This attitude of the Turkish Government was maintained in spite of repeated warnings that they did not realize the gravity of the situation until on the 30th December the Turkish Ambassador communicated to me the substance of a fresh Irade far to the note from the Porte of the 29th of that month, which you duly forwarded to me.

This Irade falls far short of a fulfilment of the promise of the Sultan and his Government. It is obviously based on misconceptions of the geographical details, and proposes a new condition with regard to the dispatch of troops to the nine cantons which His Majesty's Government are entirely unable to assent to.

On the 9th ultimo I instructed you by telegraph to explain to the Porte the views of His Majesty's Government on this communication. The representations which you have made have met with no response, and I have now to request that you will point out to the Porte that after the long delays which have taken place, and the trouble and expense which has been incurred in this delimitation, His Majesty's Government cannot any longer tolerate these repeated attempts on the part of the Turkish Government to frustrate the

will inform the Turkish Government

Firstly, that although the line of frontier described in the new Irade is obviously founded on a misconception of the geographical details, His Majesty's Government take note of the fact that the Sublime Porte have sent instructions which will enable their Commissioner to draw the frontier line of the Subah tribe from Mudariba to Sheikh Marad through Jebel Kuwah, leaving this fort and the village of Turia with the wells on the Turkish side of the frontier.

Secondly, that with reference to the large tract of country, measuring some 550 square miles, belonging to the Subah tribe, which His Majesty's Government have placed in Turkish occupation, they take note of the declaration that the Turkish Government will not alienate any portion of the Ottoman dominions at any time or under any circumstances as a binding pledge to Great Britain in regard to this territory.

Thirdly, that His Majesty's Government consider that the districts known as Dhabiani, Juban, Naawn, and Rubakun are dependencies of the Yaffa, and not British cantons, but that they reserve a final decision upon this point for the Commission which will delimitate the frontier from Lakmat-es-Shub north-east to the desert, in virtue of the Imperial Decree of the 13th February, 1903.

Fourthly, that His Majesty's Government will hold the Turkish Government to the pledge given in the new Irade that no Turkish troops will be sent into the nine cantons, and that His Majesty's Government record their indisputable right to send British troops thither to such places and at such times as occasion may require in the interests of public security, as they have been in the habit of doing since 1837, when the districts in question came under British protection.

On this understanding His Majesty's Government will be prepared to demarcate the line from Mudariba to Sheikh Marad as proposed in Sir N. O'Connor's Memorandum of the 11th August, and now agreed to by the Turkish Government.

Should the Turkish Government raise any further difficulties in regard to the above points, His Majesty's Government will find themselves compelled to decline to pursue further the negotiations which have been so unnecessarily and vexatiously

further action my German colleague took on receiving the Sheikh's answer I have not

Herr Wonekhaus against an employé of the Chief's son and recognized heir, Sheikh Hamed-bin-Esa, the basis of it being a s.m. attempt to impress coone labour, as that which had given rise to the assault on M. Bahson a month before (Inclosure 11).

6. Sheikh Isa and Captain Prideaux being unable to arrive at any uniformity of views in the matter, it was agreed between them that it should await settlement pending my arrival, which was expected at no distant date (Inclosure 4 and elsewhere).

7. Meanwhile, on the 14th November, occurred the second incident: that of an between a number of Arab and negro subjects of the Sheikh and a section of the army of His Majesty the Shah's subjects residing in Bahrain for purpose trade in the course of which two Persians very nearly lost their lives and several were more or less damaged.

The Sheikh, as will be seen from the correspondence, having failed to take any particular steps in the matter, the Persians sent across to Bushra a telegram addressed to the Mushir-ul-Dawlah, a translation of whose reply forms Inclosure No. 18; and as rowdiness was still in the Manama Bazaar, and the Persians refused to open their shops, Captain Trevor was able to arrange for the dispatch of His Majesty's ship "Reconquer" to Bahrain on the 27th November as a precautionary measure.

Matters were at this stage when I arrived at Bushra from the Karun on the 20th November, and having been posted in the details by my Assistant, I left without disembarking for Bahrain. From this point I think what follows can be preferably related in diary form.

8. November 30.—Arrived Bahrain at noon. Captain Prideaux and the Sheikh came off to the "Lawrence" to interview me. They arrived separately, and I saw Captain Prideaux first for a few moments. I learnt from him that just before the arrival of the "Lawrence" a few days previously Sheikh Ali-bin Ahmed and Hamed-bin Eesa, with several followers, had proceeded together to the mainland, ostensibly for purposes of shikar, but still absent. Except for this fact, there was no change in the position as last reported, and the Persian shops remain closed.

I then received the Sheikh's visit. After exchanging with him the usual greetings and after some conversation on general topics, I explained to him that having heard of the two recent incidents at Bahrain, on reaching civilization I had come straight without landing at Bushra with a view to settling them without delay, and was consequently somewhat exercised to learn from Captain Prideaux that Sheikh Ali and his followers, apparently the principal persons concerned, had been permitted to absent themselves from Bahrain indefinitely, especially as it was known that I should arrive a few days.

In reply, Sheikh Eesa assured me that the party had only gone for purposes of sport and were expected back at any moment; at all events, he would at once send a messenger after them and get them back to the ship. I inquired whether it was usual for members of his family to undertake extensive hunting trips during the exhausting fast of the month of Ramadan, and asked that I begged he would take effective steps to insure their early return in order that I might be enabled to settle the two outstanding cases.

The Sheikh's answer was that the party were only implicated in the first case, and that pending their return could not do with the later incident, and that Captain Prideaux had only heard the Persian suggestion that if I would kindly inquire into the case myself I should find that it was all the fault of the Persians.

This assertion as to Sheikh Ali's non-connection with the second incident seemed to me clearly desirable to dispose of the first case before dealing with or even discussing the second.

[Note: My reason for being of this opinion was that the circumstances in the first incident were not open to any doubt, and I therefore thought that the bona fide or otherwise of the Sheikh's co-operation in that case would guide me as to how to deal with him in the second case.]

We then parted, I proceeding ashore to the British Agency at Manama and the Sheikh to Muharrag to dispatch a messenger after the absentees.

December 1st.—Sheikh Ali did not return. Sheikh Eesa sent to inquire whether he should call at the Agency. I replied that as Sheikh Ali had not arrived I would not trouble him to-day, but reiterated the necessity of expediting his nephew's return, and begged that he would come over on the morrow forenoon in any case, whether his nephew had returned or not.

10. December 2nd.—Sheikh Ali still absent. Sheikh Eesa came over from Muharrag about 10 A.M., and we had another lengthy interview, at which Captain Prideaux was present. I thought it was now time to speak to the Chief plainly and to apprise him of my views, as time was slipping by. I told him that I had in the first instance frankly accepted his assurance that his nephew and followers were only out for a shooting excursion and that he could get them back at once, but that this was the third day of my presence in Bahrain, and that he could hardly wonder if I began to suspect that their absence was preconcerted.

I then went on to say that my view as to what measures it was incumbent upon him to take in regard to the German case coincided with those of Mr Gaskin and Captain Prideaux, namely, that the ringleaders should be flogged; 1,000 rupees paid in compensation; and that Sheikh Ali be compelled to leave Bahrain, subject to approval of the Government. Sheikh Eesa then entered into a long demur, in which he took up the cudgels for Sheikh Ali, and argued that he had done nothing to deserve such punishment as that involved by measures suggested, to all of which he demurred. This brought the specific question of Sheikh Ali's position in Bahrain into discussion. I reminded him that from what Sheikh Ali had told me at Muscat I had for long been aware of his character and his not unaturally disaffected attitude. I reminded Sheikh Eesa that only six months ago I had thought, confided in Mr. Gaskin regarding his nephew's treacherous personality, and had prompted our Representative to address to me a proposal for the making of a public pronouncement in Bahrain in such plain terms that Sheikh Ali would accept it as his own case, without the necessity of any specific mention of his name. I added that the idea had had my cordial approval, and that it had only awaited the advent of a more senior Political Officer at Bahrain before being taken into serious consideration.

I explained to him that his present surprising attitude in championing Sheikh Ali could only convey the impression that so long as Sheikh Ali's doings affected his own convenience and peace of mind injuriously, nothing was bad enough for his nephew.

He was told by his uncle to be disloyal, turbulent, and most felonious in his tendencies. On the other hand, now that he was involved in an obvious offence against Europeans or others under the protective patronage of the British Agency, Sheikh Eesa and his son and heir were found to take his part and give him all possible support. How did he, Sheikh Eesa, think the Government of India would interpret such an attitude on his part after all they had done for him?

In reply the Chief admitted his previous inward misgivings regarding Sheikh Ali, but explained that he did not fear his machinations or secret enmity now in his own lifetime, but rather later on after his demise. He then repeated the arguments he had employed before in palliation of what had been done, and urged that the whole incident or incidents would be adequately met and settled by Sheikh Ali effectively subdued by my giving him a severe talking to in the presence of his uncle and Captain Prideaux.

I was unable to concur in this view, and after considerable reiteration and further discussion, the Sheikh finally agreed that as soon as Sheikh Ali returned—

(1) The compensation money of 1,000 rupees should be levied and lodged at the Agency.

(2) The four or five ringleaders having been produced or identified should be whipped and expelled from Manama.

(3) That after the above two conditions had been actually fulfilled I should see Sheikh Ali in the presence of the Chief and Captain Prideaux, and should warn him regarding his departure from Bahrain pending receipt of the views of Government. I suggested his either going on pilgrimage to Mecca or on a visit to Muscat, I should be content.

(4) Sheikh Eesa also agreed, if I so desired, to publish a notification prohibiting

the custom of "Suk'ra" or "employment of forced coolie labour" by the petty Sheikhs of Bahrein.

At the same time he pointed out that he had already warned those concerned on the subject, and that we were welcome to regard it as an accepted fact that he did not recognize the practice in any way.

11. Before separating we agreed that it was of no use our meeting again until Sheikh Ali had arrived, and until the above conditions (1) and (2) had been actually put into effect.

[Note.—It was necessary to devote hours of meeting a long while in advance, as inclement weather made communication between Manama and Muharrag and between the Agency and the ships exceedingly difficult and tedious all the time I was there and impeded our work very much.]

12. December 3rd. Sheikh Ali did not return during the day, but we heard after dark that he had just returned, and was spending the night with the Chief at Muharrag.

December 4th.—About 9 A.M. a bag of 1,000 rupees was received at the Agency by the hand of one of the Sheikh's men. At 10 A.M. Sheikh Esa, accompanied by Sheikh Ali and his son, Sheikh Hamed, arrived from Muharrag.

In spite of our agreement of 2nd instant that we would not meet until conditions (1) and (2) had been fulfilled they all obtained ingress to the Agency reception room, and sent word to me that they had come and wanted to see me. I sent Captain Prideaux to Sheikh Esa my compliments and to say that the compensation money of 1,000 rupees, had arrived safely, and I was much obliged for it; but that, according to our previous agreement, the ringleaders had to be produced, or all Sheikh Ali's servants paraded for identification before I could have any further meeting with them.

Captain Prideaux brought back the reply that it was this question of the production of the ringleaders that was the difficulty. With me, they were willing, it appeared, to pay another 1,000 rupees if Sheikh Ali's servants could be spared the corporal

As this 1,000 rupees would merely have come out of Sheikh Esa's pocket of course it was not objectionable, and was eventually informed that Sheikh Ali had gone to the town to see me. A little later four culprits were produced and duly sentenced by Mr. Mahomed as having actually participated in the assault on him. I may mention here that, apart from bruises the latter received a very nasty wound on the head, and afterwards escaped having his skull fractured.

The four men having been brought and identified, Sheikh Esa asked permission to return to Muharrag, as it was now getting late, and left his son, Abdulla, with his rue men to have the chastisement of the men carried out in communication with me. Before he took his departure it was agreed between us that I would start the inquiry into the Arab-Persian affray case the following morning, and that he would send his son of Vazir to represent him, with instructions to present before me a list of his subjects whom I might wish to examine.

After his departure the matter of chastisement was proceeded with, and every possible obstruction was offered. The Sheikh's Bazaar master in Manama was the proper person to perform the operation, was sent for, and directed to bring us cane and execute the order. He absolutely refused, saying that no cane could be procured, and that it was more than he dared to have to do in the punishment of Sheikh Ali's men directly or indirectly.

Finally I was obliged to send to the Commander of His Majesty's ship "Re" for a weapon, and two Arab bystanders or retainers of his own were called upon to assist in the whipping.

They were both tried and both endeavoured to make a farce of it, and after one of two futile experiments the services of a blue jacket were called upon, and two dozen strokes suitably administered in the presence of the dorts.

The flogging was performed in the public street outside the British Agency. I have now completed the narrative of the progress and details of the case, and see that an apology is necessary for the tedious length which the relation of them has achieved. Had it been difficult to add to the present case I should not have thought it necessary to report in such detail. But in order to deal with the second case which I have to report upon in continuation of my telegram "Bahrein Affairs No. 2," dated the 12th instant, the Government of India will, I think, find it necessary

to take the whole situation now existing at Bahrein into serious review. It is consequently most important that they should be in a position to form conclusions on the detailed facts reported apart from any personal views which Captain Prideaux or I may be found to put forward.

13. I have taken advantage of opportunities during the remaining five days of my stay in Bahrein of gauging its effect. I can only say that both missionaries, merchants and others with whom we came in contact were of opinion that in the eyes of all law-abiding men bad was needed and had had a highly salutary effect.

14. As regards the incident generally I have the honour to point out that when the temporary situation at Bahrein came to my knowledge on the 20th November, I had to regard it from three points of view:

(1) That a young European trader of quiet and unobtrusive character had been assaulted and that in order to reassure European subjects of our own and those of other nations for the safety of whose subjects in Bahrein we are morally responsible, prompt and vigorous action was evidently necessary.

(2.) That Herr Wonekhaus' reference to the German Consulate at Bushire had brought to the attention of the British Government the fact that the German Government had recently done in another connection and that the German Government, if they could show that we could not or did not give their subjects effective protection.

I may add confidentially that I find that my active Russian colleague thought the Bahrein incidents of sufficient public interest to send a long wire to the Government on the subject.

(3.) It was evident from the reports of our local officers that owing to the rule of a considerable amount of roudyism was generally prevalent in Manama, which it was necessary to repress.

15. I shall say more on the subject of Sheikh Ali's future when reporting on the subject to the Government of India will be pleased to instruct me by telegraph to the effect in accordance with their own views:

(1) That the compensation money of 1,000 rupees may be paid over to Mr. Mahomed.

(2.) That I may be permitted to warn Sheikh Esa as from Government that his three weeks' absence stipulated for by me, should it so happen that Government have not been able within that time to come to a decision with regard to him.

I have from Sheikh Esa in this connection forms of enclosure

to 2 in No. 18

Mr. Gushen to Major Cox.

Bahrein, October 1, 1901.

I HAVE the honour to forward, for your information, copy of a letter, dated the 20th September last, I have received from Herr Wonekhaus, regarding an outrage committed by Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed and his followers in the German firm's premises on Sunday last.

I would venture to report that immediately on the receipt of information I proceeded to the scene of the outrage and interviewed the German firm's staff concerned in the matter, and found the main facts to be as set forth in the above-quoted communication.

I caused Sheikh Ali to appear before me to explain the outrage. He stated that by his orders his servant went out to secure a coolie for his service, and when he got hold of a man's native clerk he assaulted his servant with a stick and inflicted

several contusions on the man's body and had drawn blood, also he produced a broken cane alleged to have been employed by the clerk.

The man was produced, and upon examination no traces of assault were visible, and the stick was admitted to belong to Sheikh Ali's man, but evidently a scuffle had taken place, and the clerk had wrenched the stick from Sheikh Ali's man and made use of it. The man, however, appears to have been the aggressor by seizing hold of the clerk by the throat, and the latter defended himself in the best way he could.

Sheikh Ali's man apparently took an exaggerated story to his master, whereupon the latter sent after the native clerk to appear before him, but being occupied with the firm's business, he informed the Sheikh's messenger that he would go to him later on. Sheikh Ali violently took umbrage at the reply, and proceeded with a number of followers to the German's house, on meeting the clerk in the hall, asked him if he had struck his servant, and on receiving a reply in the affirmative, he struck the clerk some blows on the left side of the neck. The Sheikh's followers at the same time seized another coolie on the premises and started hitting him with sticks, and M. Bahson, an assistant to Herr Wonekhaus, hearing the noise went below, and in the attempt to extricate the coolie, received several blows at his person and head, one of which inflicted a cut a little over 1½ inches long, exposing the scalp and causing the loss of a quantity of blood.

When questioned Sheikh Ali at first denied having struck the clerk, but when confronted with him he acknowledged having done so. Further, he made no attempt to stop his followers from assaulting the coolie on the premises when asked to do so by M. Bahson, and when the latter endeavoured to protect the coolie, Sheikh Ali tried to stop him from reaching it.

Under ordinary circumstances the incident would not have been considered so serious; but the conditions prevailing in Bahrain are such as to necessitate the law's protecting the lives of Europeans and their employees should they be rep-

and the attention of the petty Sheikhs with persons in the service of the British and German firms here on several occasions, and though the Chief has warned the petty Sheikhs accordingly, they do not appear to pay any heed to him.

their employees deserting them to the detriment of their business generally.

I have considered it my duty to put the case before the Chief strongly, and demanded the punishment and expulsion of the men who were concerned in the outrage to a fine of 1000 rupees. The Chief said he would inquire into the matter and communicate with me later. I trust that you will approve of my action.

The Chief will probably endeavour to avoid doing anything in the matter as he is a little afraid of Sheikh Ali and his brothers, and it may be necessary for you to bring strong pressure to bear upon the Chief to induce him to punish the offenders.

Inclosure 3 is No 7.

Herr R. Wonekhaus to Mr. Gaskin

Bahrain, September 1

I AM sorry to have to report to you the following matter:

This forenoon some of my regulars employed coolies were engaged to shell and to bringing them into my godown; while thus employed one of the coolies was seized hold of by one of Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed's men, as Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed wanted some coolies to work for him ("sukra"). The coolie refused, and ran into my godown.

Ali-bin-Ahmed's man, asking him why he did so, and a drag, out of possession of Ali-bin-Ahmed, that if Sheikh Ali was in need of some coolies he might only go to his sakh and he would be sure of getting some, but that these coolies in question were employed just now in urgent work for me, but other coolies were at his disposal. These very coolies and none else, saying this in a very insolent way. Thereupon M.

native clerk, Abdulla, requested the man to return the empty bag belonging to me which he had taken forcibly from the coolie. This man refused again, becoming insolent. Abdulla then took hold of the bag, adding at the same time that if Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed was in need of some empty bags, too, he might send to me and ask for them. The man of the Sheikh did not listen to reason, and each of the two parties tried to tear the bag from the other. So far it

and struck him once or twice with the stick, and struck him once or twice with the stick, and struck him once or twice with the stick, and struck him once or twice with the stick.

M. Bahson, a European employed of mine, who was sitting in the office upstairs, heard the noise and ran down, succeeding, together with another man, to separate the two parties. M. Bahson then upon returned to the office upstairs.

Five or ten minutes after this M. Bahson was informed by one of my boys that Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed had come into my house himself, whereupon M. Bahson invited the clerk Abdulla, to come upstairs, which the Sheikh refused. The clerk, a personally well known to him, either he had struck him, and, receiving a reply in the affirmative, he struck Abdulla several blows with his stick. Abdulla crossing his arms and offering no resistance whatever of respect for Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed, which, according to my personal ideas, this man never deserved. I must add here that Sheikh Ali did not come all by himself, but was accompanied by about twenty of his servants and followers, who all of them were armed with sticks.

Some of Sheikh Ali's people took one of my coolies who was absolutely unconcerned in the matter, and gave him a strong hiding in front of Ali-bin-Ahmed. This all happened in my own house, just below the office.

When M. Bahson heard a noise again he went downstairs, and, seeing that the Sheikh's men were hammering away at one of my coolies in my own house, ordered them to stop, and when this had no effect covered the coolie with his own body, naturally assuming that this would effectively stop their outrageous conduct. M. Bahson had run down as he had been sitting in the office, without a hat on, and naturally neither carried stick nor any other arms, which in itself should have proved to the people that he had absolutely no aggressive intention. Instead of stopping the beating of the unfortunate coolie the well-meant action of M. Bahson produced quite an unforeseen effect. The lot of Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed's people—about twenty of them—at once started to hammer away with their sticks at M. Bahson, inflicting among other injuries a 1½ inches long and about a quarter of an inch broad, which produced a very strong loss of blood. In fact, M. Bahson being covered with his face, and chest, the shirt being soaked with blood. During

it on M. Bahson Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed pretended to protect M. Bahson by holding of his body and one of his arms, which naturally, instead of proving a protection, only hindered M. Bahson in the use of his arms, which he was holding up for protection of his head. Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed did not order his men to stop, and, in M. Bahson's opinion, his behaviour proved that his people were acting under his command. Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed, never really meant to protect

M. Wonekhaus, who had been out of the house visiting a customer, received news that fighting was going on in his house, and, hurrying back to the house, found that the coolie had just left off striking M. Bahson. On his arrival most of the assailants dispersed, Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed himself with five or six of his followers, remaining in the house. M. Wonekhaus, having no idea what really had happened, but seeing M. Bahson bleeding profusely, asked Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed to come upstairs and explain matters, telling him that I could send to the British Assistant Political Agent, Mr. Gaskin, and that it would be well for him, Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed, to have the matter settled through Mr. Gaskin privately. To this Sheikh Ali first agreed, but when it was for two or three minutes he decided otherwise, and said he would go to his house and if anything of him was being wanted Mr. Gaskin might send for him in a very insolent tone. Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed then left with his followers, and M. Wonekhaus cleaned M. Bahson's wound and face of the blood and bandaged the wound. Ten minutes after this Mr. Gaskin arrived in my house, and the rest, of course, is known to you.

I have had repeatedly to complain to Mr. Gaskin against the highhandedness of

Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed's and other Saikhs' servants and followers; and the custom of the Sheikh's men pressing any coolies they happen to meet for work which the Sheikh wants to be done is a highly deplorable habit, which I venture to think ought to be stopped by the responsible authorities once for all.

I do not think it necessary to point out to you the seriousness of the offence committed by Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed and his followers, and I only venture to inform you of M. Bahson's idea of compensation and satisfaction.

The least which M. Bahson expects is—

1. The public punishment of the more conspicuous assailants, who are known to M. Bahson and my clerk Abdullah, who was present. These men will be recognized when the culprits will be brought before M. Bahson. In order to be sure that the punishment is really meted out to the culprits, M. Bahson suggests that he should be present at the occasion.

M. Bahson expects a money compensation of 1,000 rupees for the injury received, and

2. I should think it fit if information were to be given to all the petty islanders that they have to abstain from pressing coolies who are employed by me.

I hope that you will be able to bring the matter to a satisfactory conclusion.

Enclosure 4 in No. 78

Sheikh Isma'il bin Ali al-Khalifah to Major Cox

(Translation.)

20th Rajab, 1322 (October 1, 1904)

I BEG to forward herewith, for your information, a Petition which has been addressed to me by Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed al-Khalifah on the subject of the assault which took place between him and Bahson, the German, and to state that I am not anxious that such occurrences should happen, but after it occurred I made investigation to ascertain the truth.

It appeared that the fault was on the part of the German. He has also done further oppression, and I have received many complaints against him which I have not taken into consideration.

When Ali-bin-Ahmed submitted his petition and produced proofs that he was not guilty, and that the guilt was on the part of the German, I deemed it necessary to represent the case to you because, if such proceedings are repeated by him and others, disturbances will take place.

The decision rests with you.

Enclosure 5 in No. 78

Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed al-Khalifah to Sheikh Isma'il bin Ali al-Khalifah

Bahrain, 10th Rabi-ul-Thani

I BEG to bring to your notice that a jolly boat containing some cargo for me arrived here to-day, and I told my servants to take it. They hired coolies on the wharf. One of the coolies entered the building in which the German resides and one of our men allowed him to enter, whereupon the servants of the German turned him out and assaulted him.

The news reached me, but I did not believe that he would be sent that our men should be beaten. I dispatched some servants to inquire into the case.

On their arrival on the spot the German's servants came out and began to beat them. I could not keep quiet at that time, and I went to reconcile the parties with a view that no disturbances may occur and that I may not be blamed by the Saikhs for having acted impudently.

When I reached the gate of the building, I saw a large number of people consisting of the German's servants, coolies, and the people who work on the wharf. Meanwhile

the junior German, whose name is Bahson, came down, and caught me by the wrist and did not allow me to reconcile the parties.

Indeed, if I did not fear the Saikhs I would not have allowed him to detain me thus.

When I and him were pushing each other, his head was scratched by the wall.

I thought it necessary to represent the case to you, and you will not be pleased

and wicked.

Enclosure 6 in No. 78

Captain Trevor to Captain Prudeau

GASKIN reports a fracas between one Sheikh Ali and one of Wonekhaus' clerks named Bahson.

October 7, 1904

You might, after consulting Gaskin, inquire into the matter, and, if no settlement can be effected locally, submit a report giving your views and recommendations at an early date, and saying if you concur with Gaskin as to punishment, &c.

Note.

This message could not be sent yesterday owing to press of work. To-day Mr. Mungerin wired, suggesting I should write directly to Captain Prudeau to catch him at Manama.

I have written practically in the same terms as the message rather amplified to Captain Prudeau, and have asked in addition whether he considers that if the case cannot be settled by him and the German, it should wait till Rosent's visit.

(Signed) A. P. TREVOR

October 8, 1904.

Enclosure 7 in No. 78

Captain Trevor to Sheikh Isma'il bin Ali al-Khalifah

October 11, 1904

I HAVE received your letter dated the 20th Rajab, 1322 (1st October, 1904) regarding the unfortunate incident which has happened between your nephew and a German. I have also received the version of the incident from the opposite party, and it seems to me that it is very important, in the interests of all concerned, that you should use your best endeavours to settle the matter at an early date in consultation with the Political Officer.

Enclosure 8 in No. 78

Captain Prudeau to Major Cox

Bahrain, October 31, 1904

I HAVE the honour to refer to my predecessor's letter No. 225, dated the 1st October, 1904, with which Mr. Gaskin forwarded a copy of a letter received from M. Wonekhaus on the subject of a fracas that had occurred in the latter's courtyard, and in which he reported the demands he had made to the Chief of Bahrain for satisfaction, and asked for your approval concerning them.

On looking into the case myself, I cannot help thinking that the terms imposed by Mr. Gaskin are unreasonably severe, and this opinion I find is held both by Messrs. Wilberforce and Zwemer, the other Europeans on the island, and also by all the natives of the place.

15.6

2 C

Before, therefore, mooted the subject at all to the Chief, I have endeavoured to persuade M. Wonekhaus to lessen his demands, but unfortunately without success.

3. Copies of the letter I addressed to M. Wonekhaus and of the reply I received are enclosed. M. Wonekhaus' letter has not effected any change in my opinion. The "Sukhra" custom being such as it is, I do not think Sheikh Ali's clerk was bound to accept the coolie's word that he was in the employment of M. Wonekhaus until it was corroborated by Abdullah. I can find no evidence that Sheikh Ali instigated the assault on M. Robinson, and if it be conceded that the Sheikh's followers did not strike that gentleman accidentally, their action can still be suitably dealt with by imprisonment.

M. Robinson is anxious to see the men "struck" in a country so much affected by British influence, as Bahrain, I think the punishment of flogging should be countenanced as rarely as possible by ourselves.

Lastly, there is no doubt, I believe, that in this case Sheikh Isa's sympathies are strongly with Sheikh Ali, and that if the payment of a fine is insisted upon, it will be paid solely by the Chief himself. As the latter's impotent state is well known, I am inclined to deprecate imposing upon him this form of punishment whenever any alternative can be devised to meet the case.

I shall at the first opportunity inform Sheikh Isa that the whole question has been referred to you for consideration, and I venture to express the opinion that if you consider the terms I have suggested too light, they can be most suitably made heavier by the enhancement of the periods of imprisonment to be imposed on the Sheikh's followers or by the latter's expulsion from the island.

Inclosure 9 in No. 75

Captain Pridoux to Herr R. Wonekhaus.

Bahrain, October 28, 1904

I HAVE been considering the case reported by you to my predecessor in regard to which you claim compensation from Sheikh Ali bin Ahmed al Khatib for the assault committed by his servants on your Assistant, M. Robinson.

Having heard both sides and made further inquiries, I think that the following are the facts to be noted, there having been errors of judgment and improper conduct on the Sheikh's undoubtedly preponderating.

The first mistake of course was committed when Sheikh Ali's man refused to give up your firm's bag to your man, Abdullah. The latter, however, then erred still more seriously when he endeavoured to recover the bag by force, used language which was insulting to the quarrel, and ended by striking the Sheikh's servant with the latter's own stick. At this point it will be noticed that M. Robinson was assisted by another servant of the Sheikh's to terminate the fight, and if matters had locally been carried no further, I think your servant would have been adjudicated to be the greater loser.

I have been told that he has an overbearing manner, which in a case like the one under consideration was not advantageous to your interests. Sheikh Ali, however, immediately lost all his advantage by sending peremptorily and for Abdullah.

When entering your premises without consenting to see M. Robinson striking Abdullah, and permitting his followers to thrash one of your coolies who had no concern with the case, but who was presumably believed to be the original starter of it.

At this stage M. Robinson committed an error of judgment by going down into the moat instead of sending round word either to Sheikh Isa's chief representative on the island or to Mr. Gaskin, the British Political Officer. I do not believe that Sheikh Ali himself had any intention of causing M. Robinson to be beaten, and it is difficult to say whether his servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention. At any rate, it does not appear that the coolie was very much hurt, and the injury done to M. Robinson's sense of dignity was probably greater than that committed on his person. The fracas seems to have subsided of itself before your arrival on the scene, and the fact that Sheikh Ali accompanied you upstairs indicates I think, that he was anxious to settle the affair amicably. I presume that he left you before Mr. Gaskin's arrival on getting some idea of the terms which you contemplated demanding of him and because he thought them unreasonable.

The system of "Sukhra" is, as you know, one of long standing—a right enjoyed by all the members of the Ruling Family of Bahrain and other Arab States over the peasant class, and is not to be abolished without the exercise of a good deal of diplomacy or without time. Sheikh Ali's servant has been punished for not resisting that the coolie who started the trouble was your employee by the beating he received from Abdullah.

Abdullah has atoned for his mistakes by submitting quietly to the chastisement imposed by Sheikh Ali.

Had your man followed the proper course he would not have been assaulted, and therefore I do not think I can support his claim for personal pecuniary compensation, but it is, of course, a very grave offence for an Asiatic to assault a European without cause, and I shall insist on the coolie whom he can identify on oath as having struck him being punished by the Sheikh of Bahrain. I think that a month's imprisonment would be the most suitable form of punishment.

As to the question of the unlawful intrusion upon, and actions on your premises made either before Sheikh Isa and myself at Muharrag or before myself and the Wazir at your house, would meet the requirements of the case.

Understood in the islands that no employees of Europeans can be employed in the islands, and therefore it is not necessary to name any persons, and therefore it is not necessary to name any of your third suggestion.

I have formed on the case, and if you acquiesce in them, I think I shall be able to bring the affair to a speedy conclusion. If you are not satisfied, it will be necessary to await definite orders from my superior officer, the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, who will return to Bushra from the interior of Bahrain on the 1st of November.

Inclosure 10 in No. 75

Herr R. Wonekhaus to Captain Pridoux.

Bahrain, October 30, 1904.

YOUR letter, dated the 28th instant, was duly received by me. I cannot agree to what you say that "there has been no assault on my man Abdullah," and concerning the action of my man Abdullah, I do not think that blame is to be attached to his behaviour.

You yourself admit that the first mistake of course was committed by the man of Sheikh Ali bin Ahmed refusing to give up the bag to my man Abdullah. I believe that this was not the first mistake committed by the Sheikh's man; the first mistake was undoubtedly that he refused to give up the bag to my servant Abdullah that

Sheikh Ali wanted some coolies he might only send over and ask me for some as a favour.

According to your idea, Abdullah "erred still more seriously when he endeavoured to recover the bag by force, used language which was calculated to accentuate the quarrel, and ended by striking the Sheikh's servant with the latter's own stick."

Now, I believe, is not quite correct. I should think that if a man takes away property of mine, and be it only an empty bag, he is a thief, and I do not see the reason why a man should not try to recover his lawful property from a thief by taking it away from him, even by force if necessary.

It is not at all certain that Abdullah was the first man to use language "which amounted to accentuating the quarrel." The quarrel, he asserts, it was the Sheikh's man who used offensive language and who was even the first one to attack Abdullah had only touched the bag to force him to give it up.

When Abdullah struck the man with it Abdullah quite admits, but I do not think it fair to blame a man when being attacked first, for his getting the best of the fight.

At this point M. Robinson was assisted by another servant of the Sheikh's to terminate the fight, and of course this was a mistake. I venture to think that even at this time the balance would not at all be in favour of the Sheikh's man.

If you had been told by somebody that my man Abdullah has an overbearing manner, I should have been very much surprised. This servant of mine is with me for six years, and I daresay I can claim more knowledge of his character and manners than any outsider, and I can honestly confess that I have never noticed an overbearing manner in him in his dealings with people.

The fact of Abdullah's submitting to the unjustified flogging (sic) he received from Sheikh Ali without striking in his turn does not seem to me to bear out your presumption of his having an overbearing manner.

I must say that I, and with me probably most people, have noticed that more or less all the servants of the different Sheikhs of this place do possess an overbearing manner. This fact is borne out by the stories and threats against Europeans generally which have been started by some of Ali-bin-Ahmed's people in these days after the affair.

So much for this less important part of the affair. What happened after this seems to me to be such a serious misbehaviour of Sheikh Ali bin-Ahmed and his people that I am sorry to say I cannot at all share your views which you formed on the case. I have given you all the details of the matter in my first letter to you, and since I am sorry to hear that you have quite satisfied yourself as to the merits of the case, I only wish to rectify some errors of yours.

Firstly, you say you "do not believe that Sheikh Ali himself had any intention of beating M. Bahnsen." As for this it will not be possible to ascertain by the Sheikh's behaviour at that time, and I myself are absolutely mistaken in our belief which, by the bye, is shared by a good many people that Sheikh Ali was the instigator of the assault on M. Bahnsen.

Secondly, you say you "do not believe that the servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention." I think you might take it for granted that there could be no question of accident as M. Bahnsen has not been beaten (sic) once or twice or even three times accidentally, but M. Bahnsen admits emphatically that he has.

The question of it having occurred accidentally is quite out of possibility. What their motives were I myself have no doubts. I do not believe either that it was caused by "exasperation at his intervention."

Thirdly, you say you "do not believe that the servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention." I think you might take it for granted that there could be no question of accident as M. Bahnsen has not been beaten (sic) once or twice or even three times accidentally, but M. Bahnsen admits emphatically that he has.

Fourthly, you say you "do not believe that the servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention." I think you might take it for granted that there could be no question of accident as M. Bahnsen has not been beaten (sic) once or twice or even three times accidentally, but M. Bahnsen admits emphatically that he has.

Fifthly, you say you "do not believe that the servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention." I think you might take it for granted that there could be no question of accident as M. Bahnsen has not been beaten (sic) once or twice or even three times accidentally, but M. Bahnsen admits emphatically that he has.

Sixthly, you say you "do not believe that the servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention." I think you might take it for granted that there could be no question of accident as M. Bahnsen has not been beaten (sic) once or twice or even three times accidentally, but M. Bahnsen admits emphatically that he has.

Seventhly, you say you "do not believe that the servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention." I think you might take it for granted that there could be no question of accident as M. Bahnsen has not been beaten (sic) once or twice or even three times accidentally, but M. Bahnsen admits emphatically that he has.

Eighthly, you say you "do not believe that the servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention." I think you might take it for granted that there could be no question of accident as M. Bahnsen has not been beaten (sic) once or twice or even three times accidentally, but M. Bahnsen admits emphatically that he has.

Ninthly, you say you "do not believe that the servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention." I think you might take it for granted that there could be no question of accident as M. Bahnsen has not been beaten (sic) once or twice or even three times accidentally, but M. Bahnsen admits emphatically that he has.

Tenthly, you say you "do not believe that the servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention." I think you might take it for granted that there could be no question of accident as M. Bahnsen has not been beaten (sic) once or twice or even three times accidentally, but M. Bahnsen admits emphatically that he has.

Eleventhly, you say you "do not believe that the servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention." I think you might take it for granted that there could be no question of accident as M. Bahnsen has not been beaten (sic) once or twice or even three times accidentally, but M. Bahnsen admits emphatically that he has.

Twelfthly, you say you "do not believe that the servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention." I think you might take it for granted that there could be no question of accident as M. Bahnsen has not been beaten (sic) once or twice or even three times accidentally, but M. Bahnsen admits emphatically that he has.

Thirteenthly, you say you "do not believe that the servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention." I think you might take it for granted that there could be no question of accident as M. Bahnsen has not been beaten (sic) once or twice or even three times accidentally, but M. Bahnsen admits emphatically that he has.

Fourteenthly, you say you "do not believe that the servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention." I think you might take it for granted that there could be no question of accident as M. Bahnsen has not been beaten (sic) once or twice or even three times accidentally, but M. Bahnsen admits emphatically that he has.

Fifteenthly, you say you "do not believe that the servants struck him accidentally or through exasperation at his intervention." I think you might take it for granted that there could be no question of accident as M. Bahnsen has not been beaten (sic) once or twice or even three times accidentally, but M. Bahnsen admits emphatically that he has.

I now come to what you call "an error of judgment committed by M. Bahnsen by going down into the melée." When M. Bahnsen heard the row downstairs it was his duty to go down and to see what was going on in my house. When coming downstairs he saw that an innocent coolie employed by me was being brutally beaten by several of Sheikh Ali's men, it was again his duty to interfere and tell them to stop this, or do you expect M. Bahnsen or me to quietly look on when an employee of mine, who is absolutely innocent, is being brutally maltreated in my own house by a set of people who entered my house without my consent?

I think some blame might have attached to M. Bahnsen if he had tried only to touch any of these people or if he had only used strong language, but nothing of this was done by M. Bahnsen. He simply asked them to stop immediately and stretched his arms over the unfortunate coolie, naturally presuming that this would effectively stop the proceeding. I fail to see where the error of judgment on M. Bahnsen's part comes in. It appears to me that you seem to think very lightly about Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed and his followers and his servants entering my house without my consent, and behaving as if he had a right to let my employees be beaten by himself and his servants. If Sheikh Ali thought, after the first affair between his man and Abdullah had happened, that he had reason to complain he ought to have followed another course which was open to him either by informing me of it by settling the matter amicably or by directing himself to the Chief of Barein. Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed's high-handedness in the first instance alone is the real cause of the unfortunate affair, and I venture to say that if he is not made to pay damages for it some way or the other this time in future his respect for all Europeans generally will be nil, and this might lead to further occurrences of a similar kind, if not worse.

I thank you very much for what you say regarding the "Sukhra" system. It does not contain any point which has not been known to me since long.

Of course, it is "well understood in the islands that no employee of Europeans can legally be impressed by other persons"; but, if it is so well understood, why do these things always and ever happen again?

I myself have had to complain of it several times to your predecessor Mr. Gaskin, and more than a dozen times it has happened, and I have not troubled anybody with it because I got tired to complain always of such more trifling matters which nevertheless are very annoying and can lead to serious consequences, as shown by this affair. I venture to say it is not good enough that everybody in the islands only understands that European employees are free of "Sukhra," but the people, especially the servants of the Sheikhs of the islands, must be made to obey, and if they do not, they ought to be punished somehow.

The opinion which you have formed on the case and the terms you propose are so very different from what I think to be right, that I fear that an understanding about this matter between you and myself will be very difficult. I therefore propose to send in by this mail to the German Consul in Bushire the correspondence regarding the affair, and I shall put the whole matter into his hands for settlement.

Enclosure II in No 7-

Herr R. Wunckhaus to Captain Peudraux

Bahrain, November 6, 1904.

WITH reference to my letter dated the 30th October, I regret that I have to report to you another case regarding the "Sukhra" which happened to-day.

My coolies were employed in bringing wood from the boat into my godown when a man of the Sheikh's name came and asked me to let him take the wood. I refused to come along with him, stating that he was working for me.

The coolie succeeded to get the man of the Sheikh to come into my godown, where my man Abdullah told the Sheikh's man that the coolie was employed by me, and that he might look out for another one. But even now the Sheikh's man did not want to let the coolie go.

Accordingly, I have written to the Sheikh's man to let the coolie go, and I have also written to the German Consul in Bushire to let him know of this case.

Of course, the matter is important enough to complain about it but I only want to tell you that it is not at all understood that my coolies cannot be taken by the Sheikh's people in any case do not act accordingly.

1-2

I do not doubt that some of the Sheikhs have the good will not to take any coolies, but I know that the servants and followers of the Sheikhs do not mind it at all.

It is, of course, of no consequence, but I only want to state that the Sheikh's man showed an overbearing manner by speaking loudly and big and even mentioned to my clerk A. Alim that he would complain to the Sheikh about him and about me. In fact, he acted as if he thought to be in his right by taking the coolie although the same was employed by me.

As showed again how little the Sheikh's people grasp the situation.

Inclosure 12 in No. 78.

Captain Prudenaz to Sheikh Isa-bin-Ah-al-Khatifan.

Bahrein, November 7, 1904.

I RECEIVED a letter from M. Robert Wonekhaus, the German, complaining that on the 5th instant one of Sheikh Hamad-bin-Isa's servants was forcibly trying to take away one of the German's coolies while the man was bringing wood from a boat to the German's godown, that on the coolie refusing to follow the Sheikh's man the latter struck him and followed him up to the German's godown, where the German's man, Andunani, told Sheikh Hamad's servant that the coolie was in the service of the German, but he would not hear of it, and did not leave the coolie alone until he was told to do so by M. Robinson.

To prevent similar regrettable incidents in future I request that orders may be re-issued to all the Sheikhs and Amirs to the effect that no coolies in the employ of Europeans can be forcibly taken away by any one.

The system of "Sukhra" is regarded, as you may well understand, by the British Government as objectionable in the same manner as is slavery.

Therefore, ultimately affect the interests of the persons who profit by its existence. This fact, I think, might well be utilised in their minds.

Inclosure 13 in No. 78.

Sheikh Isa-bin-Ah-al-Khatifan to Captain Prudenaz.

Bahrein, November 10, 1904.

I RECEIVED your letter. You state that M. Wonekhaus wrote to you on the 5th instant that my son's servant was trying to take away forcibly one of the German's coolies and that, on the coolie refusing to obey, the servant struck him. I am sorry to hear of this and forbidding them to impress coolies in the service of the German as well as of others in similar standing.

The Germans as well as others of similar position have no authority whatever over the poor coolies that work along the sea-shore, and when they are taken for work by the Sheikhs they should be taken forcibly.

I understand that M. Robinson invents these stories for your information.

I do not like all these things as much as you would not like them. I hope you will not take these complaints as true.

Inclosure 14 in No. 78.

Captain Prudenaz to Herr R. Wonekhaus.

Bahrein, November 10, 1904.

WITH reference to your letter dated the 5th instant, I have the honour to inform you that the Chief of Bahrein, in reply to a letter I wrote to him on the subject of the recent action of Sheikh Hamad's servant has stated that he does not recognise

custom of "Sukhra," and that he cannot believe that any one of his relatives or officials would ever contemplate impressing your coolies.

I am hopeful that my letter will have the effect of saving you from further annoyance on this point.

Inclosure 15 in No. 78.

German Consul at Bushire to Sheikh Isa-bin-Ah-al-Khatifan.

(Translation.)

October 19, 1904.

I HAVE been lately informed that the servants and coolies of Sheikh Ahmed bin-Ah, your nephew, struck M. Robinson, a German, in the service of Herr R. Wonekhaus at Bahrein on the head, inflicting a severe cut, but that up to now you have not punished the culprits. I therefore request you to inquire into the affair, with a view to compensating M. Robinson at an early date and punishing the offenders with a flogging before the public.

Inclosure 16 in No. 78.

Sheikh Isa-bin-Ah-al-Khatifan to German Consul at Bushire.

(Translation.)

November 7, 1904.

I RECEIVED your letter, dated the 19th October, 1904, and learnt that you have been informed of the dispute between my nephew, Ah bin-Ahmed, and M. Robinson, the German.

I have now to inform you that this matter is before the British Government, and I cannot say anything on the subject.

Inclosure 17 in No. 78.

Captain Prudenaz to Major Cox.

(Extract.)

Bahrein, November 17, 1904.

To console himself for the slight which he considers put upon himself, Sheikh Ali has formed round his person a body guard of big men, mostly negroes, who are a terror to all quietly disposed residents in the Bazaar and whom I believe no man in the Chief's dare touch. Nearly all the men who are implicated in the Robinson affair were also taken part in this more recent case. It may be that Sheikh Isa is unwilling to see the family dignity injured through the punishment even of a nephew who is himself, but I firmly believe now that my predecessor, Mr. Gaskin's view, also is correct that the Chief dare not attempt to exercise authority over Sheikh Ali.

The fact that Sheikh Ali is disloyal at any rate in thought to his uncle is proved by his saying to me when he called at the Agency to welcome my arrival that if he had the share in the Government, which his father had held, he would be happy to use his influence towards the proper reformation of the Customs administration.

I now have to make the following recommendations. In the absence of a British gun-boat it is certain that no punitive measures will be committed to by Sheikh Ali. As early as possible a gun boat may be sent here, and, if possible, allowed to remain here during the month of Ramzan, as I am not too confident that even the Hindu community

13. I think that on the arrival of the man-of-war Sheikh Ali should be summoned on board with all his male servants. M. Robinson might be invited on board and asked to identify the men who were concerned in the assault on himself. All such who may be known to have taken part also in the later affair should be soonily flogged on board, then sent to Muharrag for one year's imprisonment and then expelled from the islands, in the event of security for good behaviour not being forthcoming. I think such action on our part as this is justified by the Chief's weakness and actively wrongful attitude.

14. SHEIKH ALI has been to Bahrain, and at the proceeds. The old "Government House" should, however, be made over at a valuation to the Chief for the use of his son Sheikh Hamad.

15. Before commenting upon the correspondence forming the inclosures to this communication, I venture to record a few facts, or observations, which may perhaps be of use to elucidate the general situation at Bahrain.

elements, namely:—

(a.) Sunni Mahomedans—Arabs with a sprinkling of negroes, keeping up a constant and more or less migratory connection with the Arabs of the mainland. Among them is the family of the Ruling Chief which is of the Utroba tribe.

Inclosure 18 in No. 7b

Mushir-ed-Dowleh to the Persian Traders in Bahrain

(Translation,
(Telegraphic.)

Tehran [undated]

Keep yourselves calm, for I have had a long talk with the British Minister on the subject and I am sure he will take early steps to get the affair settled and get the culprits punished.

Inclosure 19 in No. 7b

Undertaking given to Resident by Sheikh of Bahrain, dated 25 Rameen, 1325.

(Translation.)

I, SHEIKH Isa-bin-Ah-al Khalifah, urge that my personal self-respect and that of my family will be broken if Sheikh Ali is compelled to leave Manama immediately before the Rameen. And which will be only three days hence. But I hereby give the most solemn undertaking possible that within seven days after the departure of Major Cox from Bahrain Sheikh Ali and his followers shall also leave Bahrain for change of air and shall not return until I receive a reply from Government, and if no such reply or instructions shall arrive up to three months in all) Sheikh Ali shall be at liberty to return to Bahrain.

And if the Resident will accept this arrangement I promise and undertake to prevent any further disturbance of the peace of Bahrain, and to ensure that no recurrence of rowdiness for the future.

Inclosure 20 in No. 7b

Major Cox to Government of India

Bushire, December 17, 1904

1. I have been informed that the British Minister in Bahrain has been informed of the presence of Arabs and negroes upon certain subjects of His Majesty the Shah, residing in Bahrain for the purposes of trade.

2. Before commenting upon the correspondence forming the inclosures to this communication, I venture to record a few facts, or observations, which may perhaps be of use to elucidate the general situation at Bahrain.

elements, namely:—

(a.) Sunni Mahomedans—Arabs with a sprinkling of negroes, keeping up a constant and more or less migratory connection with the Arabs of the mainland. Among them is the family of the Ruling Chief which is of the Utroba tribe.

(b.) Shi Mahomedans, namely, "Bahrainis"; that is, the old Bahraini stock, of somewhat uncertain origin. Out of the total island population, which, if I remember right, is estimated at about 70,000 souls, the proportion of the two denominations is about equal, the Bahrainis being a little in the majority.

In the population of Manama are included between 50 and 100 Persians who are engaged in unpretentious trade and mostly owning small shops in the Bazaar. They are, I need hardly mention, of the Shia persuasion.

It will be realized that they form an infinitesimal part of the Manama community and like our own Indian traders, were it not for the measure of Pax Britannica which the presence of a British Representative assures to them, they could hardly trade or reside in complete security in such surroundings even at ordinary times.

The Chiefest among these Persians is one Haji Abdul Nabi, who conducts the cargo-lading business on behalf of the person who "farms" the monopoly for that work from the Sheikh, namely, the Vazier Abdurrahman. For some months past the said Vazier has been away on the Mecca pilgrimage and during his absence Abdul Nabi has conducted the work with full powers from his principal.

He is also employed to some extent by Messrs. Gray, Paul & Co., and is at the same time the authorized contractor for the provision of British mail-freight when stationed at Bahrain. Abdul Nabi may be not far more nor less scrupulous than others of his stamp, but the British India Company's Agent informed me that from their point of view he is a satisfactory man, and that during his conduct of the cargo-lading business, they had experienced much less of the petty thieving from pack goods of merchandise in transit which had formerly been very prevalent.

Three months ago it appears that this Abdul Nabi had personally traced and run to earth a gang of Arab house and boat thieves, and had brought about the discovery of a quantity of stolen goods at their lodging. Eight Arabs were in consequence imprisoned, of whom five were subsequently released and three still remain in confinement. In consequence of this occurrence Haji Abdul Nabi went for some days afterwards in fear of his life, and though that apprehension had gradually passed off, he was well aware at the time that the present incidents arose that he was not a *jeune homme* among the less law-abiding members of the Arab population of Manama, in which category that Sheikh Ali and his retainers had come to occupy a prominent position.

4. Having got thus far I may well leave Captain Pridoux' original report to furnish the details of the fracas which occurred on the 14th November last.

In this communication he states clearly the details of what occurred as ascertained immediately afterwards from the best sources of information available; and his account receives circumstantial corroboration from the testimony of Dr. Thomas of the American Mission, who attended to the injured. I think it may be as good as an event of the incident in the light in which it was presented the following morning to every "man in the street" not actually concerned in it, and except in one or two minor matters of detail, I have little doubt that it represents the correct version of what took place.

5. It was obviously useless to expect any of the injured members of the small Persian community to testify openly to the names of persons whom they had recognized in the mob for fear of other persons. Captain Pridoux, on the other hand, making inquiries from them and others confidentially, ascertained the names and identity of some twenty-five persons who had been recognized among the mob. Among these were several retainers of Sheikh Ali, some of whom had been concerned in the attack upon the German trader a short time before.

There can be no doubt that the origin of the disturbance was a pure accident and not connected with religious differences. The religious cry was taken up, and every "Mogul" who was unfortunate enough to appear on the scene was immediately not upon and beaten.

6. For the occurrence those Persians who had shops in the Bazaar closed them, and from the Sheikh's attitude that he did not intend to listen to Captain Pridoux would try and get the matter settled before the local Bazaar Committee, they sent over a telegram to His Majesty the Shah asking for support. The Mushir-ed-Dowleh replied that the British authorities had undertaken to see justice done. Meanwhile Captain Pridoux was proceeding to Manama pending my arrival there.

7. On reaching Bahrain on the 30th November, I found that the Persian shops were still closed, and that the only development since the Political Agent's letter of the 19th November (Inclosure No. 20) was the departure of Sheikh Ali and his entourage,

including many of the rowdies "wanted," for a hunting excursion on the mainland of Bahrein.

As I mentioned in my report on the assault upon the German subject, Sheikh Isa's attitude led me to anticipate some difficulty in settling the second case, and I feared that if both were handled together the first case might be buried in conjunction. I therefore decided to abstain from intervention in the matter of the Sunni-Shia affray until I had done what I could in the German case.

The latter occupied me till the evening of the 4th December.

December 4.—On that afternoon when I told Sheikh Isa that I was now ready to take up the inquiry in the second case and make the investigation which he had invited me to do, he produced from his pocket a testimony paper ("Istishhad") executed by one of the two chief Sunni Mullahs in which a number of persons purported to have testified that they had seen Persians beating Arabs.

Handing me this document the Chief said that this was the testimony and complaint of his Arab subjects, and he begged that I would see justice done. I replied that the "Istishhad" was of little use to me by itself and that I should want to see all the persons mentioned in it and examine them. He acquiesced, and it having been decided that I should start the inquiry at 8 a.m. next morning, he promised to keep his younger son Abdulah in Manama with instructions to send to me any of his subjects I might wish to examine and to depute his elder son or his acting Vazir to

bring witnesses who had been directed to present themselves at the appointed time, but I was kept waiting 2½ hours for the Sheikh's representative. Eventually Sheikh Hamed, the son, and the acting Vazir Sherideh put in an appearance, and the former intimated that Sherideh had been deputed to attend on the Chief's behalf. For Sherideh's correspondence ending with this Office of the 4th March, 1901.

He went on to say, however, that it would not be practicable for Arab witnesses to present themselves for examination by me, for in the first place they would not appear in the presence of the Shias and in the second they were dismayed by the punishment awarded to Sheikh Ali's servants the day before. I endeavoured to explain to Sheikh Hamed the sanctity of a British Court and the unreasonableness of this attitude, pointing out that his father had particularly asked me to make this personal inquiry, and now that I was beginning to do so he refused to send me the men whom I might want to see.

I failed, however, to make any impression upon his ignorant obstinacy and finally told him that I could not afford to waste more time and must at any rate get on with my work. He would like to interview his father on the morrow, and I gave him the warning to Sheikh Ali in his presence regarding his departure from Bahrein, and then to show him (Sheikh Isa) the results of to-day's inquiries into the Arab-Persian case.

Hamed then returned to Muharrag and the Vazir Sherideh remained while I recorded the statements of the Persian sufferers. I gave him every opportunity to put questions and cross-examine, and his behaviour gave me no cause to complain.

Copies of statements accompany (Inclosure 77) and I request perusal of them, but in view of what follows it seems unnecessary to discuss the details of them at this point, and I will therefore discuss them with the observation that in most cases the wounds and injuries of the witnesses and the medical evidence afforded corroboration of the general truth of their story and proof of the severity of the attack made upon them.

9. The examination of these witnesses took me till late in the evening.

December 6. Next morning Captain Prideaux and I visited Sheikh Isa. He being an old man and feeling discomfort from the cold wind and sea on the journey over from Muharrag, we had offered to visit him instead of asking him to come over again.

His two sons and Sheikh Ali were present, and after the exchange of greetings with the Sheikh, I proceeded to explain my views to Sheikh Ali as to the necessity of his leaving Bahrein forthwith with his unruly followers.

He replied that he had no other course open to him than to accept such arrangements as Sheikh Isa and I might come to with regard to him.

Thereupon the Chief proceeded to speak stoutly in defence of his nephew, but how far his attitude was genuine and how far assumed in order to save his face before his nephew I am unable to say. The drift of his arguments was that his nephew had been

sufficiently punished by the fine of 1,000 rupees and the flogging of his servants, and that he had done nothing to deserve the harsher treatment of the Government's orders. (As to the fine, I fear it must have been paid by Sheikh Isa himself.)

After some concessions on either side, he was at last induced to remain for the night and then absent himself and his entourage for three weeks pending receipt of the orders of the Government of India.

10. This matter having been disposed of, we went on to discuss the Arab-Persian affray case.

Sheikh Hamed's intimation

for examination

... not let me examine them, and all that now remained for me to do was to explain my ideas as to the steps which should be taken to punish the offenders and compensate the sufferers, and discuss

... what my views were. (See Inclosure 50.)

At the same time I explained that while these were my personal views, I was quite ready as long as I could hear him out to meet him half-way in any reasonable suggestion, or to refer his proposals to Government.

At first, he proceeded to fall back again upon the argument that I had only listened to the Persian version, and had not seen the "Istishhad" of the Arabs as recorded in the Istishhad which he had given me. Again I explained to him that such an Istishhad, set up as it was by a Sunni Mullah, could not be accepted by any British Court or considered as unopposed, and without an opportunity of cross-examination the contention therein, and that this opportunity he had at the last minute refused.

After some argument he ended by saying that he was now willing to send to me witnesses for examination, but could not agree to send any person who had

... new very well that if these witnesses came now they would come tomorrow. Sheikh any excuse for saying that I had refused any advance of his, and therefore him to send his representative as before. We then took leave.

11. December 7. Sheikh Ahmed and Sherideh duly presented themselves, together with the persons mentioned on the Istishhad. I proceeded to examine them. Sheikh Hamed was very obstructive at first. I had given him a seat on my right facing the witnesses and he seemed to intend that I should examine them in the ordinary way, and when I proceeded to elicit their statements by interrogation in the ordinary way, he persistently interrupted with attempts to put words into the witnesses' mouths or to prevent them from saying something of a committing nature. I bore with him for some time with a good deal of long-suffering, but his communications and cross-examination of each witness till I had finished with him.

I examined him that day and the remaining two the following morning. Copies of their statements are attached (Inclosure 28), but they are worth very little. The statement which they had evidently been tutored in.

In any case they were obviously sent there for a purpose, namely, to give proof that it was the Persians who attacked the Arabs, and that was the chief point that they were anxious to make clear.

The statements of some of them, however, under examination rather corroborated Sheikh's argument that it was the Arabs who were attacked, not a single Arab was or has been produced who suffered the slightest injury, nor do the Arab witnesses seriously maintain that any did come to real harm.

The bad sight arising from neglected eye disease of the young man Ramzan lends

probability to the story given by him as to the origin of the fracas, and though it is possible that, after the collision with the Seedie, Ramzan rounded on him and struck the first blow, yet the same bad sight from which Ramzan suffers makes that supposition less probable than the other.

There is no doubt, however, that the collision referred to was the origin of the row, and whether the Seedie struck the first blow or the Persian, we know that in the result two Persians, both perfectly harmless individuals, and one a decrepit octogenarian were very nearly killed, and seven others severely beaten.

To one perusing the statements of the witnesses, it will, I have no doubt, suggest itself in several places that another person mentioned might have been called, or that a particular point wanted judicially clearing up. It must be remembered, however, that after each sitting I interviewed Sheikh Isa and that his attitude gave me little reason to hope that my examination of witnesses at all was likely to be anything more than a farce owing to his impossible attitude.

12. December 8.—After taking two more statements of persons who had got tired of waiting, and had absconded the day before, I proceeded with Captain Prideaux to Muhiarra, to see the Sheikh.

I was prepared for difficulty in bringing him round, but not for the change of front which we now experienced.

I began by telling him that I had examined all his witnesses, as desired, and asked him what impression his son and Vazier had given him of the nature of their testimony. He replied that they had duly posted him.

I then showed him the chief statements that I had brought, and asked him whether he would like to have them translated to him now, or whether I could leave an interpreter with him to do it at leisure. He said "No;" he did not want them read or translated, he could see for the matter himself if he wanted to hear their statements. I replied that in that case all that remained to be done was for me to give him my opinion on the case, and with his permission I proceeded to do so.

13. I explained that the only point on which the evidence of the Arabs seemed to throw any doubt was as to whether, after the collision in the street, it was the Persian or the Arab boy who struck the first blow; that that point did not seem to be of the first importance, and was certainly no excuse for the murderous attack which had been made on a whole family, including an unfortunate old greybeard, who had been innocently sending his way home after his long Ramzan day in his shop.

I continued that, in spite of his allegation and the Mullah's "Istahbad" to the effect that it was the Arabs who had been attacked and had suffered, not a single wounded man was produced or wound proved, nor was there a trace of any.

It was altogether contrary to probability that this one family of merchants and men of peace (Abdu Nahi's), part of an exceedingly small community of Persians, should for a moment dare to get up a concerted attack upon Arabs in an Arab town of some thousands of inhabitants.

I thought there was no getting over the fact that a serious offence had been committed by a number of ruffians among his subjects, and that it was incumbent upon him as a Ruler to set aside his religious prejudices and have adequate justice meted out.

14. I then repeated to him the measures which I had proposed to him before (Inclosure 30), and also repeated that I was prepared to meet him half way in regard to any detail, if he was generally prepared to accept my advice.

His reply to this must be noted:—

"I have only one answer to give, namely, that I will do nothing in this case except after trial by my own Shariat or Urf."

I pointed out to him (as I had done once before when he mentioned the Shariat) that this was no case for the Shariat, especially when the Shariat would be the Sunni Mullahs, Sheikh Jassam, and his brother, Sheikh Ahmad, who were themselves more or less mixed up in this affair. I added that, in any case in this instance, as he had been told before, the Persians had complained to their Government, which had officially asked us to see justice done, and that he might take my word for it that in this case, at all events, the British Government would not consider that justice would be done by a reference to the local Mullahs. Moreover, no Mohammedan could be compelled to go to a Shariat Court if he did not wish, and the Persians absolutely refused to take that course. I explained to him that it did not mean, so far as my present information went, taking the Persians out of his jurisdiction altogether.

As to his "Urf" or Civil Court, I might be excused for reminding him that no properly constituted Court of that nature existed in his territory, and that I could not agree that after what had passed any suitable persons could be found to form one upon whose integrity and intention to do justice any confidence could be placed.

The Sheikh, however, was quite obstinate, and would give no other answer. Captain Prideaux will bear the witness that I was most patient and quiet with him, and continued for a long time endeavouring to persuade him not to come to a deadlock with me, but to agree to any sort of compromise which would allow Government that, at all events, he did not intend to be inambricate to them, even though he could not agree with their Representative. I suggested the deposit of even 1,000 rupees at the Agcha and the detention of six of the ringleaders pending reference to Government. But he would have none of it, and added what amounted to this: "If Government wish to seize Ramzan, even, their arm is long, and they can do it; but I will under no circumstances consent to the trial of these Persians by any Tribunal but my own Courts."

15. It will thus be seen that he had ceased to argue as to the merits of the case itself, or that only one side had been heard, but had asserted his position, and was standing out on the question of his jurisdiction over the Persians, a point which he had discussed with Captain Prideaux in the first instance, but had subsequently dropped.

Having quite failed to alter his determination, I told him I much regretted that we had arrived at a deadlock, and could no more than report the fact to Government, and then took leave. We had been with him over two hours.

16. I remained in Bahrein the following day, as it was the Ramzan Eed, and it seemed possible that some retardance or condition might occur but all went off quietly, and I left for Bushire on the 10th December, leaving His Majesty's ship "H.M.S. " there.

I now give a narrative of the progress of the case. It now remains for me to offer some comment where it seems called for, and to make recommendations for the future for the consideration of the Government at Bushire.

17. Although the Sheikh finally made the question of jurisdiction the bar to any settlement, I sought myself whether it was really so in fact, and think he was not. If the case was that, having heard from his son and his Vazier that the Arab witnesses had fallen to pieces in a great measure, and gathering, at all events, that they had failed to impress me, and that he would therefore no longer be able to argue with me regarding the merits of the case itself, and being unwilling, or unable, owing to the influence of Sheikh A. and the Mullahs in Maharra, to propose a punishment to the Arabs, he had determined to fall back on the question of jurisdiction.

Upon this question of jurisdiction generally I hardly know what the opinion of the Government of India will be. To the best of my belief (and this view is supported all round by members of the Residency Staff) we have interfered to protect Persians before, but time does not admit of our verifying this from my records; but the matter leaves. Personally I unhesitatingly express the view that, as we have a virtual protectorate over Bahrein, it is politically necessary and advisable that we should protect Persians, as well as other foreigners, at all events to the extent of preventing perpetration of injustice upon them.

In the present case I can hardly doubt, in view of the our conventions

between this Office, the Tehran Legation, and the Persian Government, that

Government will decide that it is necessary to afford protection

now come to the attitude of the Sheikh.

18. The fact, however, that he should feel able to act in such a way was, in my opinion, a much more sinister significance, and my ten days enforced sojourn in Bahrein has brought me to the conclusion that the position there is very unsatisfactory indeed.

In Sheikh Isa we have a Chief who owes his existence, his position, and his maintenance in that position, entirely to us. More than that, in his interests, we took the unusual step of recognising his son Hamed as his heir, in order to strengthen his hands.

Considering these facts, and considering also the time that he has been in close

sessions with a British Representative, both he and his son Hamed seem to me to be as fathered men, or their own slaves as Rulers.

Sheikh Isa, being as he goes over at Muharrag is so weak, or so lame, or so to hear the somewhat inconvenient responsibilities of a Ruler, that his Representative in Manama knows so the same master but he is one necessary a power less chief, as raised by Sheikh Ali, and those whom he employs or protects, and cannot keep Manama in order.

His son and heir, Sheikh Hamed, who, I may mention, is by the same mother his cousin or half-brother * Sheikh Ali, and seems to be personally an overbearing ignorant young man, has apparently no better appreciation of his present and prospective position than his father and does not give much promise of being a more satisfactory Chief.

1. Sheikh Isa himself is full of years, and I am not prepared to say that he is personally or actively doing either that Manama should become lawless, or that specific injustice should be perpetrated but he is surrounded by evil advisers (e.g., Mahomed Abdul Wahab Vager Sherideh and the Manama Mullahs, Jassim and Ahmed) and there is no little doubt that on the whole he is a very unsatisfactory ruler, and that Bahrein as it is now, does the British Government no credit as a principality over which it has long exercised a virtual protectorate. In fact, I fear that the Rev. Mr. Zwimmer was not very far from the mark when he wrote five or six years ago, regarding Bahrein:—

"The position is small, and bribery is universal, and, except in commerce and the Slave Trade, English protection has brought about no reforms in the island."

The question now to be practically considered is what further action is to be taken in the present case. I can hardly foresee what the decision of the Government of India will be, and can only therefore make suggestions, regarding probable

If it is decided that we protect these Persians (and I do not see that we can well do otherwise for if we failed to do so their only safe course would be to leave the island precipitately), then I fear that there is no amicable way out of the difficulty; we shall have to coerce the Sheikh Isa.

If it is determined to take that course, to what extent is it to be done? I think we should gain little by deposing Sheikh Isa and putting up his son Hamed, for the latter is I fear too old to be moulded in any way, and if left to himself will certainly be an unsatisfactory as his father.

Short of proclaiming a full British Protectorate, which might perhaps create alarm at the present time, the only course would be to select one of the sons of Sheikh Isa, deposed uncle, Mahomed-him-Khanla, of whom there are many living, and some said to be promising. The deposition of Isa and his sons, and the appointment of a son of Mahomed with a binding treaty with us, would be a simple matter, but again such a step may perhaps not suit the policy of Government at this juncture.

Failing that, the only alternative is to make the best of Isa and to ease the present case by obliging him to carry out my terms or the decision of Government in the matter and to pay a fine in addition for his refractory behaviour. We might also threaten to replace him by one of Mahomed-him-Khanla's descendants.

22. Captain Pridoux is of opinion, and there is I think something in it, that the Sheikh had perhaps become alarmed at the change of Agents at Bahrein, and had connected it with a determination of the Government of India to take over his Customs, and this has inclined him to stand on the defensive in this recent matter and form common cause with Sheikh Ali and that for this reason our disinterestedness might be suspected if the taking over of his Customs was allowed to become an item of our punitive treatment of him in the present connection.

I admit that there is force in this. On the other hand, if we are going to coerce the Chief, it would save a good deal of trouble to include the Customs question and have done with it, seeing that it has been troubling us so long. I must leave the question in the hands of the Government of India.

I now only have to discuss the means of coercion. The position in this connection is not quite so simple as it was when coercive action was last taken at Bahrein. There

* The mother was first married to Ali's father, Sheikh Ahmed, and bore him Ali. She was then married by him and afterwards married Sheikh Isa, and bore Hamed.—P. Z. Cox.

considerable community of Europeans in Manama, viz., twelve or fifteen or two or three European traders, besides our Political Agent. In connection with the present case, the Sheikh who has no doubt been outraged and threatened by the Mullahs Jassim and Ahmed, could if he liked arouse a good deal of antipathy in the matter, and this has to be taken into account.

I do not think it would be advisable to propose any fresh terms or settlement to him without having at hand the means to enforce them on the spot, and at present we have not got them. If we had a small party of British troops, a small boat with a small crew and carrying only seven or eight blue-jackets, would be of no use for any work on shore.

In my opinion if it were intended to coerce the Sheikh or depose him, it would be advisable and necessary to have a second ship of war present, and to send a battalion of native infantry, or at all events four companies to Bahrein to camp for the rest of the winter on the open ground outside the Agency, for the reassurance and safeguarding of the European community and of British subjects in general, until matters had settled down.

24. Although, as I observed before, I cannot foresee what view Government will take of this case *in toto*, I have thought it advisable to write fully on all points which seem at all likely to be involved.

I may add that Captain Pridoux' views coincided entirely with mine throughout in regard to the attitude of the Sheikh and when we parted neither of us had any hope that any solution short of coercion was possible.

Writing to me the day after my departure he mentioned that he had nothing fresh to report.

Only that the Sheikh has closed all the coffee shops in the centre of the Bazaar, professedly to lessen the chances of disturbance, but actually because they are all run by Persians who have only just opened after a closure of three weeks. The Arab coffee shops are nearer the outskirts of the town and have been allowed to keep open.

It is only another instance of his hostile attitude towards the Persian community. 25. There is one aspect of the question which I forgot to include in its proper place. I venture therefore to do so now. It bears on the question of the protection of the community of Persians.

The matter, as mentioned in the body of the Report, has already been discussed at Tehran. If then we see substantial justice done to the subjects of the Shah, the fact of our having done so will be an instance of our general friendliness to the Shah's Government and subjects.

The converse would also be the case.

26. In an analogous connection with the above, I may mention that I have at this moment received an informal note from my German colleague, Herr von Munster, regretting that owing to my having been away from the German firm, which, I trust, settles the case.

7. I have omitted also to mention that supposing that the Government of India agree to the deportation of Sheikh Ali (which I look upon as of the first importance), I recommend that the period should be not less than five years, if not for an indefinite period.

To state, in conclusion, that this Report has occupied me up to the last moment, and that I shall consequently not be able to revise or alter anything, if it is to catch the mail, and this seems important. I therefore crave indulgence for any clerical errors or English of which I may have been guilty.

Inclosure 21 in No. 78

Captain Pridoux to Major Cox

Bahrein, November 17, 1901.

I HAVE the honour to report that on the evening of Monday, the 14th inst., a most serious assault was committed by the servants of Sheikh Ali-him-Ahmed al-Kamilah and other Arabs on the family of Hajj Abdul Nabi Kazerooni at

on our advice on the 7th Decem. et.—P. Z. Cox

innocent Persians who chanced to fall in their way, with the result that two respectable Persians—the father and brother of Abdul Nabi—have been dangerously wounded and even other Persians less seriously so.

2. The facts of the case, as reported by my Arab Munshi, after thorough inquiry, are as follows: The disturbances arose through a Persian servant of Haji Abdul Nabi and a negro servant of Sheikh Ali-b-n-Ahmed brushing against each other in a narrow lane of the Bazaar unintentionally. The negro Marjook, turned furiously on the Persian Kamran, and after the exchange of a few sentences knocked him down. Seeing other Persians about, he flew at them, using his stick freely, and in a few moments others of his companions had commenced copying his example. Haji Abdul Nabi, who in the "hop-hot" of the cargo-landing business, the contract for which he holds under the Chief's Waqar Abdur Rahman, came running up to subdue the quarrel, but his influence failed to stand him in good stead, and he found himself compelled to flee back to his house to save his life. By this time a number of Sunnis had joined in the excitement coming out of an adjacent mosque, the Mu'adh of which was urging them to "kill kill the moguls," and a number of others, including Sheikh Day-b-n-Seliman-al-Khalifa, whose three intimate relatives were the persons killed by the Begain on the 1st, came up from the house of Sheikh Ali-b-n-Ahmed, who is said to be tough he kept out of sight himself.

3. Haji Abdul Nabi, pursued by an infuriated mob was able to find safety in the midst of women, but his old father, aged 40 years and his brother were caught, dragged out of the house, and most brutally assaulted. The other Persians injured were mere onlookers, and it is a noticeable fact that no Arabs were at all seriously hurt though at the present moment an "Intahbad" is being circulated for signature amongst Arabs to the effect that the Persians were the aggressors and that a number of Arabs too have

been injured. My Munshi attendant, to look at the injured Persians. Report is attached for your information. I also sent word to Sheikh Ismail that I wished to see him, and he came round to the Agency at about 9 P.M., eating his food. I found his outward appearance, considerably upset at the "consequences" and certainly somewhat nervous as to the consequences. I told him that I

was not only because the Resident's decision regarding the previous case in which they had been concerned, when M. Bahson, the German, was hurt, had not been announced, but also because two or three days ago I had sent him as well as other Sheikhs, who reside in the Manama Bazaar, a private message through Haji Abbas to the effect that the Chief had written to me that he did not approve of the "Sukra" (corvée) system, and that, therefore, if cases of flagrant tyranny in connection with it occurred in the future, the perpetrators were unlikely to get support from

me. In the morning, unaware of the last incident, I called on the Chief and sent also to such of the sufferers as could move to be present at the same time. I

Sheikh Isa's attitude at first most obstinate. He declared that he would not admit any

and that if the Chief ignored my advice in this matter he would be answerable

he had heard nothing of any advice given by me to Sheikh Ali, and when I to

him that I had said that I thought that if Sheikh Ali wrote M. Wonekhaus an apology of his own initiative and offered a fair sum of money as compensation to M. Bahson, the Germans would not be backward in burying the hatchet; the Chief showed considerable signs of interest, and inquired what sum, in my opinion, would be acceptable to the German firm. This question I did not see my way to answer. The Chief at the close of our interview, in which other matters were also discussed, reiterated his declaration that justice would be done to the Persians, and I contented myself with saying that I should follow the course of the inquiry with interest. I must not omit to mention that at the beginning of our interview the Chief declared he would not admit the wounded Persians into his presence, but before I left he did see them.

4. On my return to my house I heard that the two chief ringleaders had again just been assaulting Persians in the Bazaar, that all the Persians in consequence were keeping their shops closed, and that Sheikh Ali's men were patrolling the streets in bands of ten and fifteen on the lookout for casual Persians. I, therefore, sent Haji Abbas back again at once to the Chief with this news and a message that if any further harm was done, he himself could not possibly be absolved from blame. I repeated a suggestion that I had made that Sheikh Ali should be ordered to reside in Muharrag, during the month of Ramadan, and that the Chief should send over some of his own immediate followers from Muharrag to police the Manama Bazaar streets. The Chief sent me back word that he would see that no further trouble occurred, and also that he had after all decided to hold the inquiry himself. He did not, however, follow the advice I had given him as mentioned above.

5. Yesterday, Wednesday, I continued my inquiry. I have now been brought to me that Sheikh Isa has sent a message to Haji Abdul Nabi that as he appealed to me for help he need expect no consideration from him. The Persian sufferers have all been told to

community

11. The man responsible for this outbreak, I am convinced, is Sheikh Ali-b-n-Ahmed. You are aware that his father until his death unofficially shared with Sheikh Isa in the Government of the islands. He lived in the large house on the sea-shore in Manama City, which is still recognised as "Government House" and occupies the whole of one side of the open square in which the saluting gun lies, and close to the Customs office and general landing stage. This house is now the property of Sheikh Ali, who took great offence at Sheikh Isa's appointing his son Sheikh Hamad to succeed to his father's position instead of himself. To console himself for the slight which he considered put upon him, Sheikh Ali has formed around his person a bodyguard of big men, mostly negroes, who are a terror to all quietly-disposed residents in the Bazaar, and whom I believe no man in the Chief's entourage dares touch. Nearly all the men who are implicated in the Bahson affair have now also taken part in this more recent case. It may be that Sheikh Isa is unwilling to see the family dignity injured through the punishment even of a member

to exercise authority over Sheikh Ali. The fact that Sheikh Ali is disloyal, at any rate in thought, to his uncle is proved by his saying to me, when he called at the Agency to welcome my arrival, that if he had the share in the Government which his father had held, he would be happy to use his influence towards the proper reformation of the Customs administration.

12. I now have to make the following recommendations. In the absence of a quick and certain way of punishing the offenders, the only way to be submitted to by Sheikh Ali and his gang, either in the Wonekhaus case or the present one. I hope that as quickly as possible a course of action will be taken, and that the offenders will remain here using the month of Ramadan, as I am not too confident that even the Hindu community will be safe much longer.

13. I think that on the arrival of the man-of-war Sheikh Ali should be summoned on board with all his male servants. M. Bahson might be invited on board and asked to identify the offenders.

known to have taken part also in the later affair should be soundly flogged on board, then sent to Muharrag for one year's imprisonment, and then expelled from the

islands in the event of security for good behaviour not being forthcoming. I think such action on our part as this is justified by the Chief's weakness and actively wrongful attitude.

14. Sheikh Ali should be banished from Bahrein, and preferably made to reside at least ten years. His brothers can administer his properties and remit him valuation to the Chief for the use of his son Sheikh Hamad.

15. Finally, Sheikh Isa, I think, should be told emphatically that no disputes between Shi'ahs and Sunnis are henceforth to be referred to the Shara Court, any more than disputes between Hindus and Mahomedans are. The Shi'ahs, who are mostly Persians, in the absence of the Shah's Consular representatives, naturally look to us for aid. As the British Government are interested in the welfare of all classes in Bahrein (who are all Persian by origin) submit to the jurisdiction of a religious Court other than their own. All such cases should be adjudicated upon by the Chief himself or by an impartial Mejlis.

Inclure 22 in No. 78.

Dr. Thomas to Captain Prudeauz

Bahrein, November 15, 1904

I SAW nine of the wounded Persians you asked me to see, and found two of them in a critical condition from their wounds. Some of the others were badly bruised and cut, but not sufficiently to endanger life.

Mahomed-bin-Rathi has four very bad scalp wounds, and his back is one mass of bruises. He had been having fever for some days before he was wounded, which makes his condition much more critical.

Haji Kejanagi has six scalp wounds, a compound fracture of one of the bones of his head, and various bruises on his body, mainly on his back. He is in a semi-comatose condition on account of his age which is probably above eighty, his condition is quite critical.

Inclure 23 in No. 78.

Captain Trevor to Mr. Grant Duff

November 23, 1904

(Telegraphic)

NEWS received that serious affray took place at Bahrein between Arabs and Persians, in which former were aggressors. Several Persians were wounded. Our Political Agent is demanding punishment of offenders and compensation, and I am sending gunboat to support his demands. I hear that the Persians have complained to their Government by telegraph, and so let you have this information.

Inclure 24 in No. 78.

Mr. Grant Duff to Captain Trevor

Tehran, November 24, 1904

(Telegraphic)

REFERENCE your telegram No. 108.

Your action is approved, and the Mushir-ed-Dowleh has been informed of steps taken.

The Mushir-ed-Dowleh to Persian Traders in Bahrein

(Translated)

Telegraphic

[Undated]

I RECEIVED your telegram regarding the assault on you by the Bahrein Arabs. I am sure he will take early steps to get the affair settled and get the

Inclure 26 in No. 78.

Captain Prudeauz to Major Cox

Bahrein, November 15, 1904

Continuation of my letter dated the 17th instant, I have the honour to report that the Persian shops are still closed in the Manama Bazaar, and the Persians, who have been summoned to the Shara Court have refused to appear there. They state that it was Sheikh Jassem himself, the leading Mullah in the islands, who sent the worshippers out of his mosque to join in the affray, and that if they appear before him, as they have been ordered to, it is a foregone conclusion that they will be found guilty of having commenced the disturbance, and will be sentenced to punishments of flogging and imprisonment.

I believe it is a fact that Sheikh Jassem is a friend of Sheikh Ah-lan-Ahmed, and that he is not very loyal to the Chief of Bahrein. The latter only sends cases to him for settlement when he is anxious to wash his own hands of all connection.

3. Sheikh Isa is aware of the dispatch of my last letter to you by buggalow, and he has now concurred in my suggestion that the settlement should stand over until the receipt of your orders. At the same time Sheikh Ali's followers are still parading the streets in force, and I do not consider the situation will revert to normal until the arrival of a man-of-war here. I omitted in my last letter to say that Sheikh Ali did not fulfil his promise to me about sending the five ringleaders over to Muharrag, and he has recently sent me word that he broke this promise because Sheikh Jassem, the Mullah, had ordered him not to carry out my request. This excuse I do not accept as satisfactory.

4. With regard to the suggestions for punishment that I made in my last letter, I wish to observe that I do not believe there will be any difficulty about getting Sheikh Isa to acquiesce in them. There are more than one precedent in the records of your Office to show that orders for the banishment of individuals, or the infliction of fines, have been submitted to without protest or delay. Moreover, the Chief is so weak and afraid of a portion of his subjects that he is glad to be able to tell them that his actions are prompted by force majeure. I am aware that, in regard to the customs question, the Government of India do not wish to gain their ends directly by compulsion, but in the present case, if our authority is not unhesitatingly vindicated, our prestige will be lowered, not only here, but probably in the entire length of the Arab Coast. In these circumstances, I earnestly hope that you will be able to see your way to authorizing the adoption of strong measures as quickly as possible.

Inclure 27 in No. 78.

Statements of Persian Subjects

Depositions

KAL (i.e., KARBELAI) AHWAZ states on solemn affirmation that my servants were

but was overtaken and assaulted. I was knocked down in the street by a crowd of Arabs. They hit me on the head, body, and arms, and I fell insensible, and when I came to I found myself in my house.

Note.—This witness, a very old man, aged about 60, was brought in on a litter. He was in a very critical state, and not in a fit condition to be cross-examined or give further evidence. I therefore sent him away, fearing that the ordeal might kill him.

(2.)

Haji Abdul Nabi-bin-Kal Ahwas, son of last witness (No. 1) on solemn affirmation:—

I am a business man. My chief work is as hamal bashi for the Sheikh of Bahrein. I am also in the employment of Gray, Paul, and Co., in connection with the lighter service. I am also dubash for the British navy in Bahrein.

My age is about 35.

I was in the Customs warehouse (Amara) in the afternoon about 10 o'clock Arabic (= 4 P.M. English).

Two of my nephews, Ali and Rahkhuba, came and told me that my employé and weighing man, Ramzan, had been killed in the bazaar by being beaten to death by Arabs.

I thereupon ran to the bazaar, and found a crowd of people mobbing Ramzan, who was under their feet. I called out, and asked them why they were beating my servant. They then caught me by the collar, and said, "Let us take him to Ali-bin Ahmed (the Sheikh's nephew). They then dragged me a few yards out of the bazaar, when we met Maanor-bin Khairullah, acting Bazaar Master, who rescued me from their hands.

I then went unnoted to my father's shop, and found it closed, and my father just on the way to his house. I joined him. On the way we met Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed's negro, Bakheit el Nubi, who pretended to pacify me, and to make little of what had happened, and joined us himself. Close to my house is a mosque called Masjid-i-Juma. As we approached it I noticed a large gathering of Arabs armed with sticks, daggers, and swords, standing in the road. Bakheit held up his hands in a precatory way, ostensibly as if to say to them, "Let them alone," and called out, "Halakum, halakum," i.e., "Take care, take care."

I think, however, that it must really have been a prearranged sign, because they immediately made an assault upon us. They hit me on my hands and arms, upraised for self-protection, as I tried to escape. They caught hold of my cloak, which came away from my shoulders, and I escaped to the house of Ali-bin-Kasim-Bushiri.

There was no male in the house, and I went to the women's quarter. Two men from the mob followed me with drawn swords. I do not know their names, but I can recognise them. They beat me with the flat of their swords, and said, "Let us take him to Ali-bin-Ahmed." I said, "All right, I will go." I came as far as the threshold. Then I thought to myself that they might kill me, and ran back into the house among the women. The same two men followed me, and were trying to drag me out when the women began to scream, and a man entered (Mahomed-bin-Sordan (Arab), their next-door neighbour, a servant of Ali-bin-Ahmed) and took the two assailants out and left me in the house, and the door was closed. One of the two assailants was an Abyssinian slave of Ali-bin-Ahmed, and the other is his servant (i.e., Ali).

I remained there till three hours after sunset, when Dr. Thomas and Mr. Consul's request, came to see after me. They informed me that my father and brother had been very severely wounded.

The only reason I can think for this occurrence and the assault upon my employé is that it is I, as hamal bashi, who have had to detect and demand the punishment of persons who rob from the lighters and the custom-house. They have not threatened me openly, but their object is to do me harm with the Sheikh and get me out.

I have little or nothing to do with Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed personally. After the affray, during the night, Sheikh Isaa's negro came to me from his master. He asked me to overlook what had happened, and assured me from the Sheikh that the culprits would be adequately punished. I showed the messenger the critical state of my father and brother, and he was very much shocked, and went away to report.

In the morning I went with Captain Prideaux to the Sheikh to Mubarrag. I

took the wounded men in a separate boat. I saw the Sheikh in Captain Prideaux's presence. The Sheikh suggested that we should go to the Shariat.

I demurred against going to the Shariat on the grounds that his nephew, Ali-bin-Ahmed, in conjunction with the Mullahs Sheikh Jassim and Sheikh Ahmed-bin Mahzar had ordered the assassination of the Persians and put up the assault on us, and these same Mullahs are the "Shariat."

My reason for saying this was that Mullah Sheikh Ahmed and Sheikh Bernini, his brother, were standing among the mob outside the mosque looking on, and even the women came out with sticks or pestles, and Sheikh Ali's servants were mixed up in it as well. I never agreed to go to the Shariat for a moment. Ben Jilal, the Sheikh's servant, did come to me the third day after the occurrence, and wanted to take me to Sheikh Jassim, but I refused, and informed Captain Prideaux that I had done so.

There is no Mullah here whose decision or arbitration we as Shias could possibly accept in this vital case.

Evidence taken in the presence of the Sheikh's Vazir, Shereideh, who has no further questions to put.

[Witness recalled, 6th December, 1904.]

It is quite true I have a revolver. I got it about three months ago from a man in Mubarrag. The reason was this. I ran down some robbers three months ago—rate from Basmurah—who had been committing several robberies, eight were imprisoned, three are still (in prison?), and five were released and expelled. Being in fear of my life on this account, I bought a revolver in Mubarrag, and got a countryman of mine, named Ali Mahomed, to look after it for me, and to keep it in my house. Ali is a poor man, working hard for his living, and lodging next door, so I selected him in order to give him a job. My sight is too bad for me to use a revolver myself, and, moreover, I know nothing about fire-arms or the use of them. I cannot recognise anybody at more than 3 or 4 yards, and in the daytime I always wear glasses. My eyes were operated on in Bushire a short time ago, but I have derived no benefit from it.

Mahomed Reza-bin-Kal Ahwas states, on solemn affirmation:

I am a brother of Haji Abdul Nabi, and son of Kal Ahwas. I am a grocer by profession. Some time ago, about 11 o'clock Arabic (an hour before sunset) I went from my shop to my house to say my prayers, and while returning I was informed that there was a fight going (on?) between Arabs and Persians, in which Abdul Nabi was included. I reached my shop safely and closed it (or told my boys to close it), and then turned to go home again. On the way I saw my father and brother passing, together with my younger brother Mahnud. They were on their way home. I did not speak to them or join them, as I wanted to go and buy some fruit. After doing so I went in the direction of my house. When I arrived near the Masjid-i-Juma I saw numbers of people running here and there. On getting nearer the Masjid people set upon me from both sides. There was a great number of people. They were Arabs, including Sidis. They beat me with sticks and large pestles on the shoulders and head without any words or any warning. I was felled to the ground and became insensible. Some one carried me to my house, and I came to consciousness afterwards, when the doctor was dressing my head. I still feel giddy when I sit up, and have been incapacitated from work ever since. My right hand is cut and now bound up. I do not know how the wound was inflicted.

I know no reason for all this. The attack was so sudden that I could not swear to any of my assailants.

No cross-examination.

Note.—This witness' skull turned out to be fractured, but he is progressing favourably.

118

(4.)

Ramzan-bin-Ghulam, Persian, duly affirmed, states

My age is about 19. I am employed by Abdu Nah

On the afternoon in question I was in the Amarah and then went to the bazaar to buy fish. Before I had reached the fish shop, I had to pass through a very narrow part of the bazaar. My sight is very bad (one eye is evidently quite blind and the left half blind), and I ran up against a man by mistake who was standing in the street. He abused me, and when I asked him why he did so, he assaulted me severely with his fists. I could not recover from then, and do not now know who he is. The time was evening when many people are always collected, especially in Ramzan (about two hours before sunset). The man of his own accord and joined in the assault upon me. They after time I trying to escape. At last I took refuge in a shop and hid myself, and they lost me and left me. A Persian named Haji Husayn says he saw the occurrence.

No cross-examination.

(5.)

Haji Hassan-bin-Mahomed Ali states on solemn affirmation:

A few days ago in the evening I was in the bazaar buying sweetmeats. I saw Ramzan, a Persian, who was passing run into some one. The street is narrow and he ran by me. I did not know who he was, but I can recognize him. He was a youth, beardless and wheat colour. The Arab turned round and caught hold of Ramzan and abused him. Ramzan said that he did not want to do it, and that the street was narrow. He (Ramzan) said, "Is there no justice in the town, that you hustle me without reason?" Then other people came up and beat Ramzan. I made myself scarce for fear of being beaten too and saw no more. I closed my shop and went to my house.

No cross-examination

(6.)

Adulla-bin-Haji Ali Reza, aged 20, states on solemn affirmation:

I am a servant of Kal Ahwaz.

On the evening of the day in question, about half an-hour before sunset, I was taking bread from the bazaar to the house of my master, Kal Ahwaz, when I was attacked by about twelve persons with loaded sticks and walking sticks, and wounded on the head, face, arms, &c., I fell down under the blows.

While I was down and they beating me, a Bahreini came and separated them, and I got up and made my escape. I don't know the man's name, who helped me, nor should I recognize him, as I was hit between the eyes and they were dark. I can't identify any of the Arabs and Sidis who struck me, except one.

The first blow was from a negro named Marzuk. He is a loafer. I don't know whom he belongs to. I can't recognize any of the others. The first blows were on my head and knocked me silly. The Mission doctor attended me. I am still sick. I could work now, but the shop is closed. I did not see any one else attacked.

No cross-examination

Abdul Rahim-bin-Hassan Kazerani, aged about 28, on solemn affirmation:—

I was weighing sugar in my shop, that of Kal Ahwaz, whose servant I am. I left the sugar and went into the street to buy fish. I saw a crowd, and went to see what was up. I found Ramzan with a group of men, who were beating him. There were a great lot of them, Arabs and Sidis. When I went up, they hit me on the head

119

and arms. I received about six blows; after that I became insensible. I remember four persons striking me. The names of the two are:—

1. Marzuk-bin-Zaid, a loafer Sidhi boy
2. Saad-bin (P) an Arab, also a loafer

I could recognize the other two, one is Marzuk's brother, the other a relation of Marzuk. I believe I was carried on a donkey to my house by one Sadiq, but have no recollection. I was insensible for two days, and was attended by the Mission doctor. I am not able to work yet, and my hand and head still give me much pain. I was beaten to insensibility before Sadiq and Abbas were beaten, and do not know who beat them.

(8.)

Abin-Ghulam Hussein, about 20 years of age, states on solemn affirmation:—

I am servant to Haji Ahwaz and work in his shop. I was about to close the shop for the day (one of Haji Ahwaz' five shops), when I heard that Ramzan was being killed. I ran for the spot, but when I got as far as Abdu Reza Dowahi's shop, I was assaulted by three persons from a crowd. They hit me over the head with sticks, and I fled towards Kal Ahwaz' house; but before going there I lay low on the sea-shore till all was quiet.

The men who struck me were negroes. I can recognize them, but do not know their names. I don't know but people tell me they are Ali-bin-Ahmed's servants. I may know them by sight. I have been two years here.

I know Abdul Rahman-bin-Hassan. He is my fellow servant. I did not see him beaten, nor did I see anything of him at all at that time. They brought him home in the night. My head was bad and bleeding, and I know nothing about it at the time.

No cross-examination

(9.)

Abbas-bin-Kal Reza Nayar states on solemn affirmation:—

I am a carpenter, and work with my father, who has been employed at work on British Agency building. My age is about 25.

One day some time ago my father sent me to the bazaar about 4 P.M. to buy food. We were working at the Residency at the time. I went first to my house to get a saucer for ghee, and then went to the bazaar. At the entrance to the bazaar I was suddenly attacked. There was a crowd of over 100 Arabs and Sidis. There were even women there who joined in. I received a shower of blows from the mob. I recognized two of my assailants

1. Is well known as Bukheit-ol-Nubi.
2. Marzuk, a negro.

Both belong to Ali-bin-Ahmed. When they prepared to strike me, I said "What's up?" They replied, "Ask your father." A common insulting form of reply.

They knocked me down, and I became insensible. When I recovered my senses I was in my own house, and found that my coat had been cut open and my watch stolen, also 8 rupees just received from Mr. Zwemer as pay. I presume the Arabs took me

I do know Abdul Rahim-bin-Hassan, if he is the same as "Rahimu," but did not see him on this afternoon. I only heard from the Mission doctor that he also was one of the wounded.

I was not in the bazaar that afternoon. I can give no reason for the assault upon me except that I am a Persian. I have never been maltreated before during seven years' residence here.

No cross-examination

120

(10.)

Mahomed-bin-Kal Salmon Bushiri, 25 years, on solemn affirmation states:—

I am a baker. I have a shop of my own near the bazaar. Between 9 and 10 (Arabic) on the day in question I heard a noise going on in the bazaar, and went to see what it was. I had hardly reached the spot (at entrance to the bazaar) I got a blow from a mashab (knob-kerry with a lump of pitch at the end used for fighting) in the face on the left cheek bone. I still suffer much pain, and cannot masticate. There were many people present, but I was only beaten by one, an Arab.

I do not know his name, and could not recognize him if I saw him.

I fell down when I was hit.

I had 8 rupees in my pocket, which were split. I picked myself up and ran for my life.

I came from Bushire less than a month ago, and do not know Arabic, and did not understand what the mob said. I was so frightened that I did not close my shop. A friend kindly did so for me, namely, my partner, Kal Kazim. I took refuge in my house.

I did not see any one else being beaten.

Inlosure 28 in No 78

Statements of Arabs sent to Resident by the Sheikh of Bahrein.

(12.)

HAASAN-BIN-AHMED IBRAHIM, aged about 40, on solemn affirmation:—

I remember the occasion on which the disturbance occurred; it was 5th Ramzan. On that afternoon I went to the bazaar to buy necessaries (which the Persians deal in). I made my purchases and was going back to my house, when I saw a disturbance going on near Abdul Raza Dawani's shop. Persians and Arabs were mixed up and quarrelling. I did not go near them. I did not try to stop them, as I thought they would beat me, and I got away as quietly as I could.

I saw Abdu Nahi coming towards the crowd from the opposite direction. I had got up on to a shop counter in order to see what was going on, and saw over the heads of the quarrelling people that Abdu Nahi, preceded by a servant, was coming from the opposite direction. Abdu Nahi's servant had a revolver in his hand. I don't know his name. I could identify him if I saw him. He did not fire the revolver. I then went to my house. I had no curiosity to see any more, and wished to get away, and ran as quickly as I could. I know no more.

There were 100 or 200 men, I should say. I did not count them.

I cannot say how many Arabs or how many Persians there were. (After being prompted by Sheikh Hamad, he says the Persians were in the majority.)

I was sent for by Mullah Sheikh Ahmed with the others last Friday.

No further cross-examination.

(13.)

Salah-el-Mirzan, negroid, aged 40, states on solemn affirmation:—

I am a diver's assistant (ghais). I live in Bahrein. I remember the disturbance early in the month. I said afternoon prayers in my own house. Afterwards I went to Buzazi's shop to buy coffee. Before I arrived there, I saw near the shop of Muallim that a servant of Abdu Nahi, a one-eyed man, was caught by one Saad Gahiani, and was trying to get loose, in order to go for the Arabs, of whom there were two boys, who wanted to go and fight him. As the Nahi's servant was being held, the two boys began fighting. A large number of Arabs—I can't say how many—were collected there. Meanwhile Abdu Nahi arrived with some of his servants and some of the shop

121

people. Abdu Nahi called out "Bazan," "el Ghawazi fil bet," "strike." "I have the money in my house" (i.e., money for paying compensation if necessary).

They struck a negro named Marzuk-bin-Ismail and made his face bleed, and he ran away. I did not see any wounded person in the street, nor did I see any one wounded except Marzuk.

I was sent for last Friday to Sheikh Ahmed's (December 2nd), and they wrote down my statement.

No cross-examination.

(14.)

Ahmed Naur-Bahreini, aged 40, on solemn affirmation, states:—

I am a rice seller. I remember the disturbance at the beginning of this month, the 4th or 5th. On that day I was in my shop selling groceries. My shop is on the bazaar. The disturbance was far from my shop. I could not see it from my shop. A number of Persians passed my shop going towards the bazaar. I don't know who any of them were. They were like masons. They went silently together. No one that I recognized was with them. Afterwards they came back about ten minutes later, and Arabs were with them. The Arabs were frightened and running away, and Persians followed them. There were not more than fifty persons, or slightly under. When I saw the Persians, they were beating the Arabs. I saw no Arab killed, or any one did not see any Persian killed but I saw Abdu Nahi's father and brother.

After I saw the Persian masons coming back, as above stated, I closed my shop. I closed early owing to the disturbance, as I thought there was no more chance of business.

When I shut up, I went towards my house. I saw people beating Mahomed Kid Reza and his father. I did not help them, I am too poor a person. I made off to my house. Arabs were actually beating them. I cannot recognize any of them. There was a crowd of about 80 or 100 persons—Arabs, homo-burn negroes, and some women.

There were only two Persians—Mahomed and his father. Abdu Nahi was running after them.

They reached him, but he escaped by his good luck. He escaped to Al bin-Kazim's house. I saw him go in there with people after him, but I do not see other people enter the house. The people made closed the door. I then went home and did not come out again. I don't know what was the beginning of the row. I wrote a thing in an ishlahad (testimony paper) about this. I gave it in the house of Mudah. The Mullah asked me to say what I had seen. I told him I had seen the Persians running after the Arabs. Saad Megu wrote it. He is a shopkeeper. I did not tell them all I have told you. They did not ask me so much, they only took down a few words from me and then showed me to go.

Cross-examined by Sheikh Hamad:—

Some of the Persian masons had canes and some thick sticks—I don't know what for, I don't know. They were about fifty altogether. The Arabs were carrying nothing in their hands. I saw a revolver in the hands of one of the servants of Abdu Nahi. He did not fire it and I don't know what he did with it.

When the masons passed back from bazaar, Saad Kazim's son got a good beating and fell down and got up and bolted and hid himself in the shop of Mubarak-el-Gamel. After that they left him alone and the Persians dispersed.

11A.

di-Mand, Arab, aged 40, on solemn affirmation:—

I am a goods shop in the "Souk-el M..."
... of this month. I said my "asr" prayers that day at the mosque of Mahomed-bin-Ahmed. After that I returned to my shop and stayed there until the disturbance began. The first that I saw was that Abdu Nabi passed my shop with many Persians. I only know one who had a revolver. I can't say why I not see him, only I closed my shop and went away. Nobody told me the word "Bazar" although I usually know the weapon as "fard". Abdu Nabi had a stick in his hand and so had the others. They passed me and I saw no more.

I was subsequently sent for by Sheikh Ahmed with the other people. I don't know what day, but about ten days ago.

They asked me what I know and I said I saw Abdu Nabi in the bazaar in front of his servants saying to them "Bazan, Bazan, el Falas fel hat". He said those exact words.

The others have quoted him differently, and it is to be noted that "Bazan" is Persian and the rest Arabic.

(15)

Abdul Aziz bin-Sa'ud, negroid, aged about 40, states on solemn affirmation:—

I am a diver in the service of Abdu bin-Husayn Doseri. I live in Bahrain in a house of my own. I have been here the whole of Ramadan. A disturbance occurred about the 5th. I was here at the time. In the afternoon I said my "asr" prayers in the mosque called "Jannan" and afterwards went to the Persian bazaar and sat outside a Ha wa shop. I had no business there particularly. I sat talking to a friend, Ahmed-bin-Hajr Abdulla. I sat there about three hours or three and a half hours. The name of the owner of the shop was Hajr Abdulla and Ahmed, his son above-mentioned. No one else was sitting there. While there I saw Abdu Nabi's weighing boy standing near the Halwa shop. He was doing nothing particular. Another boy, an Arab, passed him and ran against him. The servant of Abdu Nabi caught hold of the Arab boy by the neck. The Arab boy had his brother with him and they both closed with the...

This was quite close to me. I went up and interfered and stopped them. They none of them had sticks, but small canes, which they used but did not hurt one another. After I separated them they went away. After fifteen minutes later Abdu Nabi came himself to the Amara. He asked the two Arabs who had quarrelled with his servant. I do not know the Arabs' names. I should recognize them if I saw them. The Arabs did not return the abuse. Abdu Nabi then went to the Amara at least I suppose so, as he brought back workmen with him. He was away about a quarter of an hour. When he came back, he was with his workmen walking in front of them. He had nothing in his hands, but ordered his men to "Bazan" strike. He meant to strike four or five Arabs who were sitting there, including the two boys who had quarrelled with his servant. They did not kill any Arab in my presence, nor did I see any wounded or hurt. They then left the bazaar. I returned to my house. I saw no more disturbance, nor did I see any one wounded, but I heard there was a row in the street, but was not curious enough to go and see it.

I was subsequently called by Mansoor-bin-Kheir Allah (last Friday, the 2nd December) to Sheikh Ahmed's house after noon prayers. Azzur Sherwadeh was present, and others whom they had collected for testimony. Mullah Sheikh Ahmad-bin-Mahzar took my statement. Mullaan Megu wrote it. They asked me what had happened. I told them as above. They wrote it down. I gave my verbal evidence to Sheikh Ahmed once before, but he did not write it down. He sent for me. He practically governs in Manama. In any matter of occurrence in the bazaar Sheikh Jassim and Sheikh Ahmed (the two Mullahs) settle it.

I haven't the faint idea who the two Arab boys were.

123

Cross-examined by Sheikh Ahmed:—

There was no revolver in Abdu Nabi's hand.

His people struck the Arabs when he said "Bazan, Bazan," and the Arabs then left the bazaar.

I cannot say how many Persians there were.

(16)

Musa-bin-Yusuf, Arab, of Hassa, aged 50, states on solemn affirmation:—

I am a broker selling clothes. I have a shop. I remember the disturbance at the beginning of Ramadan. I was in my shop that afternoon, and, having closed my shop, was about to go to my house. While going there, I found Abdu Nabi with some Persians near the Persian shops. I saw about nine men. Abdu Nabi had nothing in his hand. His servant, Aliyan, had a revolver in his hand, and others had sticks. I can see well, his eyes look as if he could not see, being very opaque. Ali was holding up the revolver. He did not fire it. He and the men with him were running. Abdu Nabi was ahead and calling out "Bazan, Bazan," referring to the Arabs about eight or nine who were there. I saw the Persian strike a negro domestic named Saad-bin-Ferhan-bu-Khairah.

Abdu Nabi called out, "Kill him, his blood money is in my box." I passed on and went home. They hit him with sticks, but did not hurt him severely, three or four blows.

I saw no more until I got home. I was only called to Sheikh Ahmed's house last Friday (2nd December). I gave the same statement as I have given now.

(17)

Hassan Mohammed, Arab, aged 30, states on solemn affirmation:—

I am a grocer. I remember the disturbance at the beginning of Ramadan.

I was sitting in my shop in the evening. At the servant of Abdu Nabi, passed my shop. He was accompanied by five or six Bushiris, labourers; he was at their head and had a revolver in his hands, the others had sticks. They were hurrying along. Ali did not fire his revolver before me. In front of my shop they struck a boy named Qorandah-Banu, an Arab. I don't know why they struck him.

They gave him one or two blows and he limped. After I saw this I closed my shop and went to my house, fearing some disturbance.

I was sent for to Sheikh Ahmed's house last Friday (2nd December).

Sheikh Ahmed and Sherwadeh were present, and took down something of what I said.

Cross-examination

(18)

Ahmed-bin-Kazim Bahreini, aged 35, rice dealer, states on solemn affirmation:—

I remember the day of the disturbance about five or six days from beginning of Ramadan. I was in my shop towards sunset selling rice. I had people who were coming from the bazaar towards my shop speaking of a row. They said, "There was a disturbance." I did not move from my shop. I heard no more and saw no more. As I was sitting, they were going. They were going fast, and Abdu Nabi's servant I don't know his name was in front of them. Abdu Nabi was not there. I do not know where he was. I subsequently closed my shop, fearing it might be robbed, and went towards the Masjid Jama, and on the way I heard that Abdu Nabi and his father and his brother and another (four in all) had been killed by some ruffians. I went on in that direction, thinking I might be able to help Mahomed Reza (Abdu Nabi's brother), perhaps by carrying him some or in any other way.

There was no one at the Masjid. The row had stopped and the wounded men had been removed to their houses. I then went home. I did not see any one wounded then, but next day I saw Abdu Rahim Kal A-waz' servant and he was wounded, and also another man related to Hussein, whose name I did not know. I did not see the beginning of the row. I know no more. I did not see what was in the hands of Abu Nabi's masons. I went to Sheikh Ahmed's last Friday with the others.

No further cross-examination.

(19)

Hussein Mahomed, Arab, aged 25, states on solemn affirmation.—

I remember the occasion of the disturbance; it was five or six days from the Hajj. I went to the Halwa shops, but had not bought anything. I saw a crowd quarrelling there, each man had his string of beads in his hands. They were saying prayers over them and saying "Subham Allah, Subham Allah." They then began to quarrel. I looked on. I saw a servant of Abdu Nabi's, a boy with a blind eye, stand there. Another boy, an Arab, passed him and gave a pull at his coat. Abdu Nabi's servant turned round and hit the other boy with his fist in the neck. They thereupon closed upon one another. Upon this the servants of Kal A-waz (father of Abdu Nabi) came out.

The servant of Ghulam (of Abdu Nabi) tried to stop the two boys, but the other servant hit the Arab boy who had pulled the blind youth's coat with a stick. The Arab youth fell down. They were separated by other Arabs who had by now collected. At this time Abdu Nabi was standing near Mus'lim's shop. Abdu Nabi had a mason with him, whose name I do not know, a Persian. Abdu Nabi cried out "Bezan" to the blind boy and to the mason. They went on ahead of Abdu Nabi, crying out "Bezan, Bezan," strike, strike; and any one they met they beat. They had in their hands thick canes from Bombay. The blind boy, when he first quarrelled with the Arab boy, had a thin stick in his hand but afterwards a bigger stick which they fetched from the house of Abdu Nabi, about 400 yards away.

Now say I don't know whether Abdu Nabi was in his house or in the Amara. After the two boys were separated, Abdu Nabi's one-eyed boy went away alone back with Abdu Nabi and about fifteen labourers (masons). They all had sticks. They began to beat Arabs and anybody they saw in the bazaar. I went to the bazaar. I got accidentally touched by one stick on the way, but whether it was the stick of a Persian or an Arab I cannot say. I made misadil serree when the beating began. Beyond the fifty or twenty Persians I cannot say at all how many people there were there altogether, whether there were 20 or 1,000 or how many. On being read over to him, he says besides the fifteen masons there were other Persians collected from their shops, he cannot say how many, nor can he say how many people there were, but there were a large number.

Asked if he saw anybody badly hurt, he says he saw two Arabs lying in the road with blood on their faces. He did not help them. He does not know who they were. I went to Mullah Sheikh Ahmed with the others last Friday. Asked by Sheikh Hamed if he saw a revolver, he replies, "Punishment after death is severe; I cannot say I saw

(20)

Mahomed Ali-bin-Buzeizi, Arab, aged 40, states on solemn affirmation.—

I work with my father, who has a grocer's shop in the bazaar. I came here yesterday with the other witnesses. I had work and I saw that there were plenty of other witnesses to be examined. I, therefore, went away and told my father that I was going to be examined. This morning Vazir Sheroudeh came to the bazaar and told me to come to the Agency. I remember the disturbance took place at the beginning of the month (Ramzan). On that day I said my "asr" prayers in the Masjid of Jumaan, in which

the leader is Mullah Sheikh Abdul Wahab, son of Mullah Sheikh Jaasim. After prayers I went to my shop and did some writing up to about 10:30 (Arabic). Then I went to the fish-market to buy some fish. Before I got there I saw a crowd of Arabs and asked what was up, and they replied that there was a row on.

This was near a shop formerly occupied by a Jew named Razal. I forget who is there now. I stopped there half an hour and looked on. At first the Arabs went away and the quarrel was apparently over. There was a large number, eighty or so. One man, who had been the beginning of the quarrel, was taken away by the Arabs. He was a mulallad named Saad-bin-Khairullah. I saw them taking him away. I did not see the beginning of the quarrel. I did not see any other people. After they had gone I stopped where I was talking to a bystander, whose name I did not know, about the row. While I was talking I saw some Persians coming along, eight or nine, of whom I know three, namely, Ramzan, Mahomed Rahim, and one Sadiq. They were

Saad Ghahani put himself in front of them and tried to stop them. They declined, and said they were going to have it out with the Arabs, of whom there were eight or nine still standing about. Saad could not stop them, and they got among the Arabs. I am an Arab myself, but I was not afraid for myself. It was only those who had quarrelled with them that they wanted, the eight or nine who were waiting there and others who were joining them. I do not know the names of any of them. I was quite sure that these Persians would recognize me as an Am of Kaunguni and would not touch me. For that reason I stood still and watched the transaction.

They fell upon one another with sticks. I saw no one killed or wounded. No one was hurt. The row was stopped in about half an hour by one Mahomed bin-Saleh, a servant of Sheikh Hamad. He and Masour bin-Khairullah came in and separated them and they all dispersed, and no one was killed, wounded, or hurt. I then went back to my shop and stayed there till half an hour before sunset, and then closed and went home.

I know nothing more.

I went to Sheikh Ahmed's with the other people last Friday (2nd December) and gave evidence. They apparently put down what I said. I have not been anywhere this morning, except to the bazaar. On arrival there I was told to come to you.

No cross-examination.

Mutlaq bin-Mubarak, negro, aged 50, states on solemn affirmation.—

I am a khalaf on general service and get work wherever I can. I have been about thirty years in and about Bahrein.

I was ordered to come here yesterday. I came, and was here till 9 o'clock (Arabic), when I felt ill and went home. I did not ask anybody's leave. This morning a servant of the Sheikh's came and told me to come here, and I came.

I have been here all the month and remember the disturbance at the beginning of the month. On that day I said my "asr" prayers in the Mosque of Jumaan. After prayers I went to the "Sook-el-Maghassa," the pawnshop bazaar. I went and sat in the shop at Israq-el-Yahudi. I stayed there an hour. All was quiet there. I did not see a row, but while sitting there I saw some Persians, about five, six, or seven, pass by. They passed by in the ordinary way. They were not shouting or talking. They went on to the bazaar. I do not know any of them but one of them carried a revolver, and I should know him if I saw him. Although they went by quietly, I particularly noticed the revolver. I followed them about 20 yards into the halwa bazaar. There they began to beat Arabs. The bazaar was filled with a great number of people, Arabs. I did not see them till now. I saw two men struck, one on the head, and one on the shoulder, but I did not see them again. I stood there quarter of an hour. I was afraid of being drawn into the quarrel. Thanks to God's chance, I was not hit.

I was afraid of myself and the people left the bazaar. I went home and saw no more of anything unusual. I was sent for to Mullah Sheikh Ahmed's last Friday with the others.

No cross-examination.

Inclosure 29 in No. 78.

Statements of Persons sent for by Resident as likely to be able to throw light on points of fact (Nos. 11, 22, and 23)

(11.)

MAHOMED Sarhan, Arab, states on solemn affirmation:—

I am in service of Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed. I have been in his service five years. On the day that the disturbance took place I had been out hawking. On my return I saw a crowd of Arabs near the entrance of the bazaar. There were Arabs, Persians, and women and were hurrying backwards and forwards. I asked what was up. They said there was a quarrel between Persians and Arabs, and that Abdu Nabi had told his servants to be at the Arabs. I took my bird to my house. Ali Kazim's house is contiguous to mine. I sat down to wait.

Meanwhile a woman from Ali bin Kazim's house told him that men had rushed into their house. I went out and found a crowd at Ali-bin-Kazim's door, Arabs, Bahreinis, Persians, and women. I asked them what they were doing and told them to go away. The place was full of people. Some went away, some remained. Hereupon the women told me Abdu Nabi was inside and told me to come in. I went in and found Abdu Nabi. He was alone, standing near the door. I asked him how he was and he said, "As you see me." I don't know what he meant. I left and returned to my house. I don't know why the women called me, but perhaps they did so on account of the mob at the house. I then returned to my house and said my prayers.

Afterwards I made inquiries from people as to what had happened, and I was told that Persians and Arab youths had been fighting in the bazaar.

When I saw Abdu Nabi, he was in his usual health and condition. He was not bleeding or perturbed.

There were no other men in the house. I do not know why the women screamed and called to me for help.

I now say that the mob outside were all I saw.
No cross-examination.

Note.—Notwithstanding Sheikh Hamad's refusal to call any one actually implicated I sent Mr. Strengh to bring this man on the grounds that he had apparently seen Abdu Nabi (No. 2), read his statement. He evidently came, however, only tutored and prepared to lie, and kept changing his statements constantly. His evidence cannot be depended on in the slightest.

Ali-bin-Man-mud, Persian of Davis, states on solemn affirmation:—

I am a labourer under the mason Mahmud working at the Agency hospital. I remember the occurrence at the beginning of the month, but did not hear of it till afterwards. I have never been a servant of Abdu Nabi, but about three months ago I was employed by him to accompany him when he walked abroad and to carry a revolver, some robbers, Arabs of Basorah; three of them are still in prison, five others were expelled after a month. He, Abdu Nabi, went in fear of his life and asked me to stand by him day and night for a few days.

Abdu Nabi supplied the revolver and took it back after the ten days were over. I know nothing about the disturbance except what I heard afterwards by hearsay.

(23.)

MIRZA Ismail, agent of Messrs. Gray, Paul & Co., states on solemn affirmation:—

My ancestors have all been settled in Rangoon for many generations, but I was actually born in Bushire. I have been thirteen years agent for the British Indian Company (Messrs. Gray, Paul & Co.) in Bushire, and seventeen years here in their office.

I remember the disturbance early in Ramzan

127

One of the Arabs was sent to give evidence before you by the Sheikh Hassan bin

premises the whole time that the disturbance was going on, and could have seen nothing. He is a small merchant dealing in mats, rafters, cow rope, &c. He came to my quarters at 11 o'clock Arabic to see me on business. He comes nearly every day. On this particular day he came to ask quotations for London freight for mother-o'-pearl shells. I was sitting outside my office. My office, as you are aware, is on the sea-shore, nowhere near the bazaar. He stayed and talked with me for a long time. About ten or fifteen minutes before sunset, Mr. Milbarrow (my chief) came downstairs and asked me to come see the sun go down in order to set their watches and then go to pray.

I did not see him again then.

Afterwards I met him, after having heard that he had given evidence of an eye witness before you, and said to him "You who profess to read the Koran, how could you go and give evidence about the disturbance, when you know you were with me at the time, or at my place right up to sunset." He replied, "I went there after I left you." I rejoined, "but by that time it was sunset, and all the shops would have been closed." He then changed his statement and said, "No, I went before I came to you."

This was obviously false as the disturbance was not known to any of us when he was with me. I did not hear of it until I went out.

My uncle, Ghulam Ali, one of the clerks Abu Tabb, could corroborate my statement.

Before me,
(Signed) P. Z. COX.

December 9, 1904.

Note.—The above witness is a native gentleman of education and repute, whose evidence is above suspicion.

Inclosure 30 in No. 78

Memorandum of Resident's views as to punishments which will meet the case, communicated to Sheikh Isa for acceptance or discussion with Resident and Assistant Political Agent.

1. THAT the following six persons who have been named or indicated should after identification receive twenty-four stripes each, and a term of imprisonment or expulsion from the island.

2. That 2,000 rupees should be paid as compensation to the Persians* through the Assistant Political Agent.

3. That the Chief should station a special guard of his own trusted men on duty in Manama to maintain order in the bazaar.

4. Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed must leave Bahrein at once pending instructions from the Government of India as to his future.

Inclosure 31 in No. 78.

Major Cox to Government of India.

Bushire, December 24, 1904.

IN continuation of my Report, dated the 17th December, 1904, I have the honour to forward a copy of Captain Frideaux's last Report.

2. It will be noted that Sheikh Ali left according to the terms of Sheikh Isa's undertaking, but that he committed a parting act of audacious commandeering at the time of his departure; which I think serves to emphasize the advisability of his being kept away from Bahrein for some time to come.

* That is, 500 rupees each to Abdu Nabi, his father and his brother, and 300 rupees for the remainder of the family.

Inclosure 32 in No. 78

Captain Prideaux to Major Cox.

Bahrain, December 18, 1904

WITH reference to the written agreement which was given you by Sheikh Isa-bin-Ali, Chief of Bahrain, on the subject of the expulsion of Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed for three weeks from Bahrain, I have the honour to report that Sheikh Ali left for Al Kutr on the morning of Saturday, the 17th instant, i.e., within the period stipulated for by you.

The last act of this Sheikh was one of open bravado, as he sent his servants out to the down-going mail-steamer "Kangra" and took away by force the three large buggalas which had been supplied by Haji Abdul-Nabi for the reception of the "Kangra's" cargo, his servants, I am informed, actually cutting all the ropes which connected the buggalas with the ship.

3. The people here speak of this act as one of "Sukhra." It has caused considerable loss and inconvenience to the British India Steam Navigation Company, as the ship had been compelled to overcarry on the up-journey owing to rough weather.

He arrived here a day late, and the Bazaar Master took some six hours in providing other boats.

The result was that the "Kangra" left here on Saturday morning with some seventy-three packages of cargo overcarried, some of which included all the woodwork required for the Charitable Dispensary, and with a very fair possibility of missing connection with the fast mail-steamer at Muscat.

Inclosure 33 in No. 78.

Major Cox to Government of India

(Telegraphic.)

Bushra, January 10, 1905.

PL. 103 refer to your telegram, dated the 6th January, 1905. I think that the Captain Prideaux is provided by that time with his sepoy guard, which I can temporarily augment from here if necessary. The Sheikh has now had time to consider his position deliberately, and when he sees that we are prepared to force compliance with our demands, he will, in all probability, comply; but in any case it will be prudent to retain the ship there for some little time after the incident is closed. I do not favour any preliminary threat regarding the seizure of the customs, but recommend that if our present demands are not complied with by Sheikh forthwith, he should be threatened with immediate bombardment of Muharrag, and that a strong detachment of seamen and, if the contingency arises, be sent ashore to Munama in order to protect the European community during bombardment and simultaneously to seize the customs-house, which latter would only be handed back with a British official in charge. I think that the Sheikh might, in any case, when our present demands have been exacted, be punished without that any further action is taken. If such a warning is given it may have the effect of causing the Sheikh to accept the advice of the Political Agent regarding the customs when next proffered after a convenient interval of time. Please inform whether a decision regarding the general question of jurisdiction over the suby Shah in Bahrain has been arrived at by Government.

Inclosure 34 in No. 78.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick

(Telegraphic.) P.
BAHRAIN.

We would invite reference to the letters from the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf of the 17th and 24th December last, copies of which were inclosed with the letter

129

of the 5th January, from our Foreign Secretary. We consider vigorous measures against the Sheikh of Bahrain are both justified and required by the incidents now reported.

ment of India letter of the 21st April last, in which his contumacious attitude to the reform of customs was explained, and, apart from his action in the present case

1 To comply with the three demands set forth in Inclosure 30 of the Political Resident's letter No. 421;

2. To banish Sheikh Ali for a period of six months.

3. To issue notification abolishing "Sukhra," in so far as foreigners' employes are concerned. Subsequent report has been received from Cox, in which the belief is expressed that, if our demands are adequately supported, the Sheikh will comply with them without actual resort.

After our demands have been conceded, we would warn Sheikh that in future we shall not tolerate the rejection of our demands.

hat His Majesty's ships "Fox" and "Sphinx" should be dispatched to Bahrain to reinforce His Majesty's ship "Redbreast," which is already there. In the improbable event of it being necessary to use force, 150 seamen would be landed by the Naval Commission (et-in-chief, in order to protect foreigners and to take possession of the customs house. Once the latter had been occupied, it would only be restored with British officials in charge of it. We should be glad to receive an early reply to this telegram.

We are sending to Bahrain without delay the small guard to which sanction was given in your despatch of the 5th August, 1903.

No. 79.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir A. Hardinge.

(No. 7)
(Telegraphic.) P.
The Turkish Ambassador to the British Legation, Constantinople, 10th February 1905.

Inclosure intervening on behalf of the Kuwait Arabs in Persia, referred to.

It is not, we consider, advisable to claim natives of Kuwait as British-protected persons, as have been conceded to Afghans in Persia, and which are worded as follows:

"That the friendly recommendations and wishes of the British Government on their behalf should be accepted."

Telegraph the result of your representations.

No. 80.

India Office to Foreign Office. — (Received February 10.)

The Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and begs to say that he has the honour to acknowledge the receipt of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 9th February, relative to the tour of Messrs. Lorimer and Gabriel in the neighbourhood of the Persian Gulf.

India Office, February 10, 1905

Inclosure in No. 80.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

February 9, 1905.

(Telegraphic.) P.

TURKISH Arabia: Gazetteer officers' tour

My telegram of the 29th

Relevant in Persian Gulf telegraphs

I can myself state that allegations of Turkish Ambassador are distortion of facts. I have called for an explanation, and on receipt of report from officer concerned will reply fully. As regards alleged hoisting of British flag at Kuwait, it may possibly have been hoisted by Sheikh on the King's birthday, but not otherwise. The five vessels mentioned by the Ambassador must be the boats of the R.M.S. 'Investigator.'

"Gazetteer officers will leave Basrah for Muscat on Sunday next"

No. 81

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 10.)

(No. 32)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, February 10, 1905.

N.B.D. Confidential.

It has recently been reported to me by His Majesty's Consul at Basrah that Ibn Saud's father was endeavouring to obtain a meeting with the Vah with a view to the Ottoman Government of his son's submission.

The Vah has, I learn, been instructed to see him and to report as to what he is able to give for the good behaviour of his tribe in the future.

No. 82

Foreign Office to Treasury

Foreign Office, February 11, 1905

Sir,

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 31st ultimo on the subject of the recent attack by Lur tribesmen on Colonel Douglas and Mr. Lormer.

Lord Lansdowne notes that the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury sanction the proposed advance in respect of the losses of the servants, &c., one moiety to be charged against India, pending recovery from the Persian Government.

In reply to the inquiry contained in your letter, I state that his Lordship is not altogether satisfied that Mr. Lormer and Mr. Douglas were marked by proper prudence, or responsible for the incident. It must, however, be borne in mind that these officers have been severely punished for any imprudence which they may have committed, and that the survey which they undertook, in the interests of the public service, could not have been carried out without their being exposed to some danger.

That, in the circumstances, the proposed advance to the Lur tribesmen, and for doctor's fees, is a reasonable one, the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury are of opinion.

(Signed) ELDON GORST.

131

No. 83.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 12.)

(No. 34.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, February 12, 1905

N.B.D. With reference to my telegram No. 33 of the 10th instant, I am informed by His Majesty's Consul at Basrah that two Vah met Ibn Saud's father and the Sheikh of Kuwait on the 8th instant at a place within the boundaries of the vilayet, and returned to Basrah and sent off a long telegram to the Palace on the same day.

No. 84

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 13.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 13, 1905

WITH reference to my telegram No. 18 of the 20th January, relative to the dispatch of Turkish troops to the Yemen, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Aleppo reporting the calling out of twenty-four battalions for service in the Yemen.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY

Inclosure in No. 84.

Consul Barham to Mr. Townley.

(No. 4.)

Sir,

Aleppo, January 23, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that a telegram has been received by his Excellency Bekir Pasha, commanding the troops in this district from the Seraskerat, calling upon him to provide twenty-four battalions for immediate service in the Yemen.

I cannot hazard a guess as to the exact number of troops which will leave until their embarkation is reported from Alexandria and Merina, but the mobilization of at least 20,000—men will be very difficult.

I have, however, deprecating the removal of so large a force on the ground that the Nizamé regiments are enormously under their establishment owing to the large percentage of men incapacitated by beriberi, ophthalmia, and syphilis. They must, therefore, be largely reinforced from the "Ikhuyat" in order to bring them up to strength.

As there are only four regiments of Nizamé in the district (37th to 40th) yielding sixteen battalions, the remainder of the expeditionary force would be made up from reserves. There must be a very large mobilization of reserves to meet this demand and at the same time supply garrisons for the two vilayets. As I pointed out when I was in the district, these men will probably embark in the same clothes as they bring from their villages.

I have, &c.

(Signed) HENRY D. BARHAM

No 85.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 13.)

(No. 87.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 7, 1905

WITH reference to my despatch No. 51 of the 24th ultimo, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Damascus, reporting further on the military expedition to the Yemen.

I have, &c
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY

Inclosure in No. 85.

Consul Richards to Mr. Townley

(No. 4.)

Sir,

Damascus, January 24, 1905

WITH reference to my despatch No. 3 of the 11th instant, and my subsequent telegram of the 19th instant, I have the honour to report that it is undoubtedly true that twenty-four battalions of troops are now under orders for the Yemen, of which I understand that eight battalions will consist of Nizam and sixteen of Redif troops. So far as I am informed, six of the Nizam battalions will be drafted from the Aleppo district, while the remaining two will be sent from the Hauran, where they are now

The eight Nizam battalions will be replaced by a corresponding number of Redif battalions, of which six will be taken from Aleppo and two from Damascus.

The sixteen battalions of Redifs, so I am assured, will be drafted from Tripoli and Jerusalem (eight from each), the former being under the command of Brigadier-General (Jawa) Jevad Pasha, the Military Commandant of that district. As to the command of the latter, I do not know to whom it has been intrusted. The whole expedition will be commanded by a certain Lieutenant-General Ali Riza Pasha, Chief of the Staff in Tripoli of Africa, while Colonel Iszet Bey and Riza Bey, Lieutenant-Colonel Said Bey (from Aleppo), and Major Selim Effendi of the third, officers on the staff here, will serve under him.

As stated before, all these troops will proceed to Mecca by the Hedjaz Railway, in there they will be marched to Akaba, where they will embark for Hodeidah. I have just received telegrams have been received here from Constantinople asking why the troops have not already been despatched, and urging greater expedition. The Mashur is said to have pointed out, in reply, that the funds necessary for the fitting out of the expedition have not yet been obtained, and that, under the circumstances, it was impossible to

Mashur by the Se
will be received by

two Redif battalions which are to replace those of the Nizam which will be despatched from the Hauran are now being got ready here.

I hear that the only troops which will leave at once are two battalions of Redifs, which are expected very shortly from Jerusalem, and the two battalions of Nizams now at Hauran.

All sorts of rumours are current here, according to some of which San'a is being besieged by the insurgents, while, according to others, the movement is receiving active support from the British authorities at Aden.

As regards the Nejd, I have nothing further to report. I understand that the British Committee, which, it is alleged, will proceed to this district, and as to the formation of which I wrote in my previous despatch, is still awaited here by the officer who will form part of it.

Persons coming from the Nejd are stating openly here that England is supporting the aggressive action of Ibn Saud, and that British officers, disguised as Arabs, are serving under him. I mention this as well as the other absurd rumour about the

13.

alleged connection between the Yemenese insurgents and the Alien authorities to show you the trend of popular opinion. Most people who have spoken to me on the subject expressed their most fervent hopes that it was true.

I have, &c
(Signed) W. S. RICHARDS

No 86

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 13.)

Constantinople, February 7, 1905

On receipt of your Lordship's despatch No. 24 of the 17th January on the subject of the pirate Ahmad bin Selman, I caused a Memorandum, of which I enclose a copy, to be presented by Mr. Marasch, the Second Dragoman of the Interior, again urging that immediate and effective steps be taken to suppress the acts of piracy taking place in the Persian Gulf.

The Minister assured Mr. Marasch that the wishes of the Embassy would be complied with, and his Excellency at once telegraphed to the Vali of Basrah instructing him to act in conformity with the demands contained in the Memorandum.

I have, &c
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY

Inclosure in No. 86

Pro memoria presented to the Minister of the Interior on January 13 (26), 1905

(Translation)

ALLAH GIL the Ministry of the Interior addressed a communication to the Vali of Basrah on the 21st (24th) December last instructing the local authorities to lay hands at once on Ahmed bin-Selman and his associates, who indulge in acts of piracy in the Persian Gulf and especially in the Katif waters, yet, according to information just received from His Britannic Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, it appears that these ruffians have not yet been secured, although the place of their concealment is well known to the local authorities.

In these circumstances, and in obedience to the instructions received from the Foreign Office, His Majesty's Embassy beg to call the attention of His Excellency the Minister of the Interior to the necessity of giving assurances to His Britannic Majesty's Embassy that the Imperial Ottoman Government will send categorical and effective orders to the effect that measures will be taken to put a stop henceforth to these acts of piracy, that these ruffians will be immediately seized and that the value of the plundered property, which amounts to 9,042 rupees, will be restored to the victims.

No. 87

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 13.)

(No. 98.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, 1

My telegram No. 28 of the 1st instant has been confirmed by the Porte. Later advices, however, state that, unless the reinforcements despatched from Syria by way of Damascus, Mecca, Akaba arrive soon, San'a will be once more in danger of being captured by the rebels.

It appears that much delay has occurred in the transport of the troops between Damascus and Akaba.

I have, &c
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 13.)

(No. 80.)

My Lord,

Constantinople February 7, 1905.

I HAD the honour to inform your Lordship, in my telegram No. 27 of 11th inst., that Feriz Pasha had left Nijed at the head of the expedition against the Arabs. There is now good reason to believe that a large part of his force has deserted him, and he himself has telegraphed that, unless reinforcements are sent at once, his force will find itself in a critical condition.

I have not been able to ascertain the strength of the expedition.

I have &
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY

Law Officers of the Crown to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 13.)

My Lord,

Home Office, February 11, 1905.

WE were honoured with your Lordship's commands, signified in Sir Eldon Gorst's letter of the 19th October, 1904, transmitting to us the accompanying papers relative to the steps to be taken to prevent foreign interference with the rights claimed by the tribes on the Arabian Coast of the Persian Gulf in the pearl fisheries, and requesting us to favour your Lordship with our opinion.

1. As to the legal rights of the tribes within, as also without, the 3-mile territorial limit.

2. As to the procedure to be followed in expelling interlopers and dealing with their boats and fishing appliances.

We have taken the matter into our consideration, and, in obedience to your Lordship's commands, have the honour to

Report

1. That the tribes have a right to the exclusive use of the pearl fisheries within the 3-mile limit, and in any other waters which may justly be considered territorial.

As regards the fisheries beyond territorial waters, we think that a distinction must be drawn between the banks where the tribes have practised pearl fishing and waters in which no such fishery has been carried on by them.

As regards the pearl banks, we think that, as a matter of international law, they are capable of being the property of the tribes to the exclusion of all other nations. In addition to the passage cited from Vattel, reference may be made to Pothier's treatise, "Droit de Nature et des Gens," Book IV, Chapter V, section 7, and to the recent work of Professor Westlake, "International Law," Part I, Chapter IX, at pp. 186 and 187 and the case of the protection of the Ceylon pearl banks in a striking illustration of the assertion of this right in practice. Whether such rights, in fact exist with regard to these particular pearl banks in the Persian Gulf is a question the answer to which cannot be given with any certainty, as it depends on the availability of historical facts with reference to the enjoyment of these banks by the tribes and the exclusion of others from them. As far as we can judge, upon the materials before us, we think that there are grounds for asserting the existence of such an exclusive right, and we do not think that, in point of law, the fact that the enjoyment was by the tribes in common would prevent the acquisition of the right.

On the west shore of the Persian Gulf, we think that the existence of this exclusive right may be properly maintained on their behalf by His Majesty.

With regard to the deep waters in which pearl fishing is carried on by the tribes we think the case is different. There is here no definite boundary of the sea over which the right of fishing has been exercised to the exclusion of other nations, as there is some ground for saying was the case with regard to the pearl banks. We cannot see that the right claimed by the tribes to exclude other nations from these deeper waters could be asserted with any reasonable chance of success.

2. Having regard to the importance of protecting the deeper waters, and to the fact that, as above indicated, it cannot be regarded as certain that the tribes could be established to the satisfaction of any international Tribunal, we think that it would be preferable to discourage foreign interference by refusing supplies, &c., as suggested in the papers before us. If such measures prove inadequate, it may be necessary, having obtained the authority of the Chiefs for this purpose, to compel the removal of vessels engaged in fishing on the pearl banks with caution, as international complications might result from any precipitate action. It might also be practicable—whether it should be done or not is a matter of policy—to raise the question in a form suitable for decision by The Hague Tribunal.

Fishing within the territorial waters may, of course, be protected by other means. Generally, we desire to add that, having regard to the importance of the right claimed to the tribes and the fact that we cannot be certain of establishing the right claimed, it is probably desirable that the fishing by foreigners should, if possible, be indirectly stopped without raising the question internationally.

We have, &
(Signed) R. B. FINLAY
EDWARD CARSON

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 14.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 13th February, relative to the Muscat customs.

India Office, February 14, 1905.

Enclosure in No. 90.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P

February 13, 1905.

MUSCAT customs.

My telegram of the 19th December, 1904.

We have received report from His Majesty's Consul at Muscat to the effect that a temporary decrease in revenue from Customs, amounting to about 4,000 dollars per annum, is apprehended by the Sultan as a result of fall in demand for arms at Koweit. Present customs administration is a source of great dissatisfaction to Sultan, who is unable, owing to disputes, to obtain from them sufficient funds even to send his steamer to Zanzibar. Circumstances being thus favourable, we suggest that Sultan should be approached with proposals for an arrangement on the following conditions:—

1. That Head Customs Officer, to be nominated by us, should be appointed by the Sultan.

2. That this officer should be servant of Sultan. In the event, however, of difference of opinion arising on any point of importance between His Highness and the Head Customs Officer, the former should agree to accept the friendly arbitration of our Political Agent.

3. Customs revenue of 20,000 dollars per annum will, on the above conditions, be guaranteed by the Government of India to the Sultan, who will also receive any balance which there may be in his favour.

4. The officer at present in charge of the customs administration would continue to act as deputy.

5. Arrangement to be terminable at one year's notice given by either party.

Political Resident in Persian Gulf is of opinion that conditions specified above may tempt the Sultan, besides being fair to both sides. In order that this favourable

opportunity, which possibly may not recur, may not be lost, we solicit an early reply. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the immediate payment of 10,000 dollars on account, and further instalment of 10,000 dollars on the day when management of customs is taken over by the new head officer. The deficit would be recovered during the last month of the year.

No. 91

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley

Sir,
WITH reference to your telegram No. 151 of the 22nd October, 1904, I transmit herewith a copy of a letter from the Secretary of State for India, dated the 10th inst. You will observe that the Secretary has been removed in accordance with the promise made, and further, that it is desirable to utilize the present opportunity to bring to the Turkish Government an understanding on certain points. It is clear in the views expressed by Mr. Brodrick, but it will be better that the matter should be deferred until further and substantial progress has been made toward the settlement of the main question of the

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 92

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley

Sir,
I HAVE received your despatches Nos. 62 and 78 of the 24th and 31st ultimo, relative to the imprisonment at Hammah of the agent of the Sheikh of Kuwait. It is satisfactory to note that the prisoner is apparently receiving more favourable treatment, but you should continue to press for his release when an opportunity presents itself.

I am, &c.
LANSDOWNE.

No. 93

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,
I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to transmit to you, to be laid before the Secretary of State for India, a copy of a note from the French Ambassador at this Court,† stating that the French Government are unable to agree to the introduction into the British Case, recently presented to The Hague Tribunal, of the name of the Sultan of Muscat as one of the parties to the discussion of the question of the issue of French Bagns to M.

Copies of the British and French Cases in this arbitration have been already

M. Cambon's note has been referred to His Majesty's Attorney General, and it will be seen from the Memorandum, of which a copy is enclosed, that Sir R. Finlay is of opinion that the Case of His Majesty's Government must naturally be also that of the Sultan of Muscat in the sense that the acts complained of are infringements of His Majesty's Government, and that so long as the substance of the contention of His Majesty's Government that he has placed his interests in their hands is preserved, no importance need be attached to the appearance of the Sultan's name in the title or text of the British Case.

* No. 74.

† No. 78.

In these circumstances, Lord Lansdowne would propose, if Mr. Brodrick concurs, that the French Ambassador in the following sense

Compromis of the 12th October, 1904, distinctly indicate that the Sultan of Muscat is the party primarily interested in the solution of the questions at issue.

That His Highness has therefore clearly a moral right to be heard on the subject either by representing his own case, or by intrusting his interests to the care of one of the parties to the arbitration.

That he has elected to commit his cause to His Majesty's Government of his own free will, and not, as appears to be implied in the French Case, in consequence of pressure placed upon him by the British authorities.

That in these circumstances His Majesty's Government do not regard it as essential that the Sultan's name should appear as one of the plaintiffs in the Case, and that it will be omitted in the further documents which His Majesty's Government will present to the Tribunal.

And finally, that His Majesty's Government propose to send copies of the correspondence to the Tribunal for their information.

Lord Lansdowne would further propose that documentary evidence of the Sultan's spontaneous decision to commit his interests to His Majesty's Government should be given in the British Counter-Case.

Mr. Brodrick will perhaps think it desirable to consult the Government of India. General, and, if so, his Lordship hopes that the reference in the telegram in order that a reply may be returned to the French Government with as little delay as possible.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

Inclosure in No. 93.

Memorandum by the Attorney General.

I do not attach any importance either to the heading which names the Sultan or to the passages in the British Case which state that he has put his interests in the hands of His Majesty's Government.

In the nature of things, the Case of His Majesty's Government must be that the acts complained of are infringements on the sovereignty of the Sultan, and the Case of His Majesty's Government must in this sense be the case of the Sultan also. It was for this reason that to the statements in the body of the Case that the Sultan had put his interests into our hands there were added to the title, I think at my suggestion, the words referring to the Sultan.

But the matter is one of form only, and, so long as the substance of His Majesty's Government's contention is preserved, I should feel no objection to the deletion from the Case of the passages referred to, and from the title of the words which seemed to me to be required as a logical consequence of those passages.

I do not think the form is worth fighting over provided the substance of our contention is preserved.

Possibly the view of the Indian Government should be taken.

(Signed) R. B. FINLAY.

February 13, 1905.

No. 94

India Office to Foreign Office (Received February 16)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and by direction of Mr. Secretary Innes forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy dated the 15th February, relative to the proposed naval demonstration, and movements of His Majesty's ships.

India Office, February 15, 1905.

Enclosure in No. 94

Government of India to Mr. Brodbeck

February 15, 1905

(Telegraphic.) P

RAHUPIN. Naval Commander-in-Chief of telegraphs on the 9th instant as follows:—
 'Naval concentration at Bahrain was arranged to take place a week ago. We have not yet received any requisition from the Government of India. The ships 'Hermes' and 'Fox' and 'Blenheim' are at Bush. Before the 1st March I want 'Fox' to proceed to Basra. 'Proserpine' will also come to Basra. The 'Pers' will be received on the 10th February by 'Pers'.

N. O.

Foreign Office to Indian Office.

Foreign Office, February 16, 1905

Sir,

I HAVE to inform the Marquess of Lansdowne your letter of the 7th February relative to attacks on Germans and Persians in Bahrain by subjects of the Sheikh, and to the measures to be taken for enforcing the demands for redress made by the Resident in the Persian Gulf.

Lord Lansdowne concurs in Mr. Secretary Brodbeck's views as to the course to be adopted. His Lordship understands that the naval and military authorities will be kept duly informed by your Department of any action that may be taken.

I have, &c.

(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne — Received February 17

(Telegraphic.) P

NEJID. Ibn Saud

Constantinople, February 17, 1905

With reference to my telegram No. 34 of the 12th instant, I have received the following telegram No. 16, dated the 15th February, from His Majesty's Consul at

my telegram No. 35 of the 11th instant. The Vah met the two again on the 13th February near the same place, about 30 miles from Basra on the way to Kuwait, and returned here yesterday. My Dragoon has received distinctly the following account of first meeting:—A proposition was made by the Vah to the Sheikh's father-in-law, Idris, and Idris's two sons, should I be sent to his country. To this Idris agreed, but said that he would not consent to the Amir's interfering in any way. Vah told the Sheikh that his telegram should not have been signed 'Haber al-Kuwait'. He would not, however, give way. No definite results were obtained.

Enclosure in No. 94

(No. 2.)

Mr.

Bombay, January 28, 1905

WITH reference to my despatch No. 39 of the 8th December, 1904, I have the honour to send herewith copies of two despatches from the Government of India, respectively the two incidents of the 10th and 11th December, 1904, at Basra. The first was in answer to a despatch transmitting inquiries from the Government of India about the two incidents.

I have, &c.

(Signed) J. H. MONAHAN.

No. 95

Sir A. Hardinge to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 17.)

(No. 16.)

Telegraphic.) P

Tehran, February 17, 1905

STATUS of Kuwait Arabs

I sounded M. Naus on this subject before sending in note in sense of your Lordship's telegram No. 7 of the 9th instant. His Excellency states that the Customs authorities acted on orders given them by the Mushir-od-Dowleh early in December last that the intervention of either British or Turkish Representatives on behalf of Kuwait Arabs should not be recognized. He is of opinion, I think, that Kuwait is regarded as an independent State by the Persian Government.

A reconsideration of proposed course may be advisable under those circumstances. I am sure that the British Government will not take any action in the same manner as Afghans, if I can first obtain official declaration from the Persian Government that they consider Kuwait as independent, and then communicate text or substance of Sheikh's agreement with His Majesty's Government. May I inform Persian Government officially, or if necessary confidentially, of this agreement? They might demand an official explanation of the grounds on which we claim same treatment as Afghans, if I should ask for it seriously.

Enclosure 1 in No. 97.

Acting Consul Monahan to the Resident, Bushire.

Bussorah, January 20, 1905.

I have the honor to acknowledge your despatch of the 8th December, 1904, reporting the incident of persecution by the Turkish authorities, I have this week sent to Fao to make inquiries a person in whom I have confidence, and the following is the result.

In October last the Acting Vali of Bussorah wrote to the Acting Kaimakam of Fao that Amir, a well-known robber, and his followers should be taken alive or

shot. When passing through Mubarek's late groves they saw two men, and asked them who they were. One of them gave his name, the other ran away, thus giving reason to suppose that he was a robber. The corporal fired and killed him, and the bullet went through the head of a woman who was standing near. She had in her hand a child, who fell to the ground, but does not appear to have died. The following is some testimony, which has an effect, to the effect that she was

The killed man was a Persian from Kumbah, not one of Mubarek's. The woman was not his wife. (She was a Persian woman.) One of the

Local Government; the three others were of Mubarek's agent, who now appeared on the scene, and who afterwards gave an inaccurate account of the incident. What became of the soldier does not appear. Eight of Mubarek's fedahs were afterwards imprisoned by the Acting Vali, but all have since been released. Some of the fedahs ran away from Fao, but after a few days returned. The fedahs of Mubarek have otherwise not suffered, and Mubarek's property has not suffered at all. My inquirer spoke with many of Mubarek's fedahs, and they agree with his other informants that there was no such robbery of Mubarek's dates as he alleges.

I have, Sir,
Yours faithfully,
J. H. MONAHAN.

Enclosure 2 in No. 97.

Acting Consul Monahan to the Resident, Bushire.

(No. 2.)

Sir,

Bussorah, January 24, 1905.

With reference to correspondence respecting the "sadda" of Sheikh Mubarek, I have the honor to state that the following is the substance of a report which I have received from my informant, the person referred to in my despatch No. 1 of the 20th instant.

Before the date season of 1904, when Fakhri Pasha was Kaimakam of Fao, the agent of Mubarek began making "sadda," of which thirteen, some of them extensive, have been made from that time to now. Mubarek began to attach importance to such work when he got the whole of the Fao property under the arbitration judgment last August. The land between the fort and the sea has gained much, it is said as much as two or three miles' breadth, since the fort was built nineteen or twenty years ago, and the great question between Mubarek and the Turkish Government is whether he may construct "sadda" in the reclaimed land. The ordinary law is that in such a case Mubarek should buy the reclaimed land from the Government, which takes all such land. He reasonably answers that this law is not enforced elsewhere in Bussorah Vilayet. However, he has made "sadda" at a distance of about 100 metres behind the fort, and has carried them southward and northward on to land reclaimed from the sea or river. He was actually (the 20th January) making "sadda," which were nearly completed, "at a great distance" to the south of the fort. This was supposed to be without the knowledge of the Acting Kaimakam, as the construction of "sadda" was stopped on or about the 16th December, 1904, by official orders, though the Acting Vali, Fakhri Pasha, wrote in October to the Acting Kaimakam that the "sadda" should not be interfered with. On the 23rd December, 1904, a Commission went to Fao to examine the question, and it reported that there was no harm to the fort. Mubarek is on friendly terms with the Acting Kaimakam.

for whom he has promised to say a good word in the hoped-for interview with the Vali at "Safawan." Mubarek has also promised that, if he fails to get the Vali to confirm him in his position of Kalimukam of Fao, he will allow him £1,150 a-year. The Acting Kalimukam and Mubarek have been conspiring together to fix on the officer in command of the fort a charge of extortion. Correspondence has passed between the Vali and Mubarek, in which the latter says he has lost the letter in which the officer demands a bribe. The Acting Kalimukam tells the Vali that Mubarek has not really lost the letter.

Of the general correctness of the above information I feel little doubt, considering the sources from which my informant obtained it. At any rate, I feel tolerably satisfied that Mubarek has now no serious reason to complain in the matter of the "sadda." He has gained by his "sadda," and added to his property about 2,000 jiriba (1,600 acres).

I have, &c.
(Signed) J. H. MONAHAN.

No. 98

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 18.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 15th February, relative to the recent disturbances at Bahrain. Copies have been sent to the Admiralty.

India Office, February 15, 1905

Inclosure in No. 98.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

BAHREIN. Your telegram of the 21st January. Following are views of His Majesty's Government:—

1. As regards trial of ringleaders, constitution of Tribunal is left to your discretion; as regards their punishment, it is considered that expulsion or imprisonment should suffice. Flogging should be dispensed with, as there are obvious objections to it in the circumstances.

2. As regards your proposal as to the fact that the Government of India is so reticent in its attitude towards the Persians, it is considered that there is no reason to suppose that the Government of India is so reticent. Moreover, suspicions injurious to our interests elsewhere in Persian Gulf might be aroused by course of action such as you propose.

Subject to the above modifications, which His Majesty's Government consider necessary, your proposals are approved. It will be necessary to take care that an adequate force is employed in coercing Sheikh.

No. 99

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 18.)

Sir,

India Office, February 17, 1905

WITH reference to the Viceroy's telegram of the 13th instant, recommending that proposals should be made to the Sultan of Muscat with a view to the reorganization of His Highness' Customs Department under an officer to be nominated by the Government of India, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to request that you will move the Marquess of Lansdowne to favour him with his views upon the proposal.

Lord Lansdowne is aware that for many years past the Government of India have

been desirous of effecting an arrangement on the lines of the present proposal. In fact, suggested in Sir C. Sanderson's letter of the 7th February, 1898, as an alternative to the control over the Muscat Customs being vested by the Sultan in the Government of India. Mr. Brodrick would be glad to know whether, in Lord Lansdowne's opinion, the conditions which the Government of India propose to attach to their proposal are open to objection from the point of view of the Anglo-French. The present moment is in other respects, particularly having regard to the proceeding at The Hague, opportune for making so considerable a departure from the

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY

No. 100

Foreign Office to India Office.

Foreign Office, February 18, 1905.

With reference to the last paragraph of your letter of the 12th January, I directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to state, for the information of Mr. Secretary

country, has been consulted in regard to the proposed communication.

Mr. N. O'Connor does not see any objection to the adoption by the Sheikh of a recommendation such as that suggested by the Government of India, and Lord Lansdowne agrees that such a recommendation might be made to the Sheikh as suggested by the Government of India.

I am, &c.
(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON

No. 101

Foreign Office to India Office.

Foreign Office, February 18, 1905.

With reference to the Marquess of Lansdowne's letter of the 30th December, I have directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to state, for the information of Mr. Secretary

The Government of India, in their telegram of the 30th December, forward an objection raised by Sir N. O'Connor to the proposed Agreement with the Sheikh of El Kair on the lines of the Agreements with the Trucial Chiefs of 1892, recourse should be had to the revival of an Agreement made with Sheikh Mahomed

Lord Lansdowne does not think that there would be any advantage in adopting the Agreements of 1853 with the Trucial Chiefs, and deals exclusively with the creation of maritime peace among the Arab Rulers. The Agreements of 1853 were, however, found insufficient to guard against the growing danger of encroachment or interference by foreign Powers, and it was considered necessary to supersede the Agreements of 1853, which are at present in force, and are intended to provide against such an eventuality.

It is to provide against similar encroachments or interference that an Agreement with the Sheikh of El Kair is now desired, and, if any such Agreement is made, it should be based upon the Trucial Agreement of 1892 rather than upon Agreements which have been found in practice to be inadequate for the purpose.

It might, no doubt, be argued that the revival of the obsolete Agreement of 1853 with the Sheikh of El Kair does not, in the present circumstances, *status quo* inasmuch as that Agreement has never been expressly abandoned or denounced. It could, however, be made thoroughly effective for the purpose in view only by giving it an interpretation considerably in excess of what its actual terms would bear.

(1416)

The objections to any course which would constitute a departure from the *status quo* apply with even greater force than when they were stated in Mr. Villiers' letter of the 18th July, 1891. For as a result of repeated failure of His Majesty's Government, the Turkish Government have Muhrate of Wakra, and would now be justified in contending that they have fully acted up to their engagements.

Lord Lansdowne is unwilling to encourage any new departure in regard to the *status quo* without further consideration. Such a change would be especially inopportune at the present time when a general sense of insecurity and suspicion prevails in the neighbourhood of the Persian Gulf where His Majesty's Government have already more than one embarrassing question to deal with. His Lordship would suggest that the question should be deferred till the whole question of the policy to be pursued in the Persian Gulf has been fully examined by the Committee of Imperial Defence.

No. 102

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne — (Received February 20.)

(No. 111. Confidential.)

My Lord,

(Constantinople, February 14, 1905.)

WITH reference to my telegram No. 34 of the 12th instant, in which I informed your Lordship that the Vali of Wessrah had met Ibn Saud's father and Mohamud-Sulhah Sheikh of Koweit, on the 8th instant, I have the honour to state that I have not yet been able to ascertain details about the meeting beyond the fact that Abdur Rahman made him a deputation to the Sultan in his own name and in that of Abdur Aziz, professing loyalty and devotion to his Sovereign and his readiness to obey his commands. He stated that he was prepared to do all that the Turkish Government required of him, and declared Ibn Saud to be a traitor to the Imperial Government against him.

The Sultan has called upon the Grand Vizier for an expression of opinion on Abdur Rahman's protestations.

I understand that the military expedition under Feizi Pasha who left the 2nd division has made but little progress. Desertions have been numerous, and the expedition took five days to reach Akko, after having abandoned the munitions and their baggage at El Haunam. The report which I have received is that, owing to the weakness of the camels and to some of them having died, the expedition is advancing with great difficulty, and that under the present conditions the provisions in their possession which are to last a month will be exhausted in ten days.

Orders have been issued that steps should be taken at once to remedy this state of things in an order which it may be found hard to execute.

I have, &c.
Signed, WALTER TOWNLEY

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne — (Received February 20.)

No. 112. Confidential.

My Lord,

(Constantinople, February 14, 1905.)

ALTHOUGH the news reported to your Lordship in my despatch No. 98 of the 7th instant that Arif Pasha has entered Sana'a at the head of a relief expedition is confirmed, the news from the Yemen is by no means reassuring. The Porte states that a second column has reached Sana'a, and that the safety of the town is consequently assured, but at the same time it is evident that many other places of importance in the vilayet are being besieged by the rebels, whilst it is said that Khatib Kalesi, a town in the Sanjak of Hadrama, has surrendered with all its military stores. Further successes among the troops that have reached Confida are also reported.

The Muavin (Assistant) of the Vali of Yemen, who has sent a bragging telegram

effect that the Government troops are victorious in the
I that the heads of rebels have been cut off and exposed in
mandated and told to be careful, and not to report such

I have, &c.
Signed, WALTER TOWNLEY

No. 103

India Office to Foreign Office — (Received February 20.)

India Office, February 18, 1905.

My Secretary Brodrick to acknowledge receipt of Mr. Villiers' 11th instant, transmitting a copy of a note from the French Ambassador against the introduction into the British Case recently presented to The I Muscat as one of the parties to the I the issue of French flags in Muscat shows

to enclose a copy of a telegram which Mr. Brodrick has addressed at of India on the subject. On receipt of their reply a further communication will be made to you.

In the meantime I am to request that you will draw Lord Lansdowne's attention (with reference to the penultimate paragraph of the letter under reply) (1) to the letter from the Sultan of Muscat of the 28th May, 1897, in which His Highness asked for the help of the British Government in putting an end to the difficulty with the French Government in regard to the grant of French flags to his subjects; and (2) to the letter from Major Cox of the 20th August, 1903, which conveyed a message from the Sultan to the British Government to a similar effect.

It will also be within Lord Lansdowne's recollection that in May 1900 the Sultan gave to Major Cox the draft of a letter, which His Highness was prepared to sign, in which he proposed formally to request His Majesty's Government to discuss this question on his behalf with the French Government. Lord Salisbury, however, was not prepared to do more than to make a friendly representation to the French Government with a view to obtaining a proper examination of the existing practice and rectification of abuses, moreover, the situation underwent a change in consequence of the Sultan's visit to Sicily in June 1903. Major Cox was therefore instructed that, in the light of the view which His Majesty's Government had taken of the situation, it did not appear that the signing of the draft letter by the Sultan would give to the British Government any *locus standi* to act officially on his behalf beyond the extent above indicated. The proposal was accordingly dropped.

I am, &c.
Signed, HORACE WALPOLE

Enclosure in No. 104.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

India Office, February 17, 1905.

and British Cases were included with letter dated the 1 Secretary to your Foreign Secretary. Objection is taken by French Government to Sultan being introduced into British Case as a party to discussion. They base their objection on the following grounds, viz.:

(a.) That the question being one which relates exclusively to the interpretation of the Declaration of 1862, the Sultan is not concerned in it.

(b.) That he cannot take part in the arbitration proceedings, either directly or indirectly, and

(c.) That it is implied in the British statement of the case that the British Government is the advocate and legitimate guardian of the Sultan.

It is proposed by Foreign Office that exclusion of Sultan's name from future documents should be agreed to, its formal introduction not being regarded as of any importance by Attorney-General. On the other hand, Foreign Office propose to maintain that the fact that Sultan is party primarily interested is indicated by the

terms of reference to the Tribunal: that His Highness has a moral right to be either by intrusting his case to one of the parties, or else directly, and that his case was intrusted to us, not under pressure, as French statement implies, but spontaneously. I should be glad to be informed by telegraph whether you concur in the proposal of the Foreign Office. It is proposed that documentary evidence showing that Sultan's interests were intrusted by him to His Majesty's Government spontaneously should be included in our Counter-Case and all available evidence on this point should be forwarded by you with as little delay as possible. Views of Government of India on any points which you may consider our Counter-Case ought to deal with should be communicated as early as possible.

No. 105.

Question asked in the House of Commons, February 22, 1905.

Mr. West.—To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, having regard to the fact that out of the 16,000 pilgrims of Egyptian nationality who have started on the pilgrimage of Mecca only 1,600 have availed themselves of the protection by travelling with the Mahmal, will he, in view of the sufferings by pilgrims last year when passing through Turkish Arabia, expedient of communicating with the Turkish Government, in order to secure some kind of protection for the pilgrims who are not accompanying the Mahmal.

Answer.

As I informed the honourable Member yesterday, matters of this kind primarily concern the Egyptian Government.

Representations have been made to the Turkish Government, and it is hoped that there may be no further cause of complaint.

No. 106.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 59.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, February 22, 1905.

THE Turkish Ambassador informed me to-day that he had been instructed to call my attention to the fact that the officers in command of two British ships of war had taken violent measures ("ont sévi") against the followers of the nephew of the Sheikh of Bahrein, who was said to have ill-treated a German subject. The conduct of the officers seemed to the Turkish Government to require explanation. I replied that it was a matter of common knowledge, and well known to the Turkish Government, that His Majesty's Government had direct relations with the Sheikh of Bahrein, and that the island and its natives are under British protection; and we held that we were within our rights in taking measures to obtain redress for the outrage which had been committed there.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

Annex.

Sir P. Curvis Note Verbale to Sublime Porte, August 12, 1895.

ON the 11th November, 1892, Her Majesty's Embassy had the honour to address a note verbale to the Sublime Porte drawing the attention of the Imperial Government to the assurance given on the 10th December 1871, by Serrvas Pasha, then Minister for Foreign Affairs, to M. Pizani, First Dragoman of the Embassy to the effect that the Sublime Porte had no intention of attacking or obtaining any supremacy over the independent tribes on the coast of the Persian Gulf, and stating that as Bahrein was now under the protection of the Queen of England, no interference by Ottoman authorities with natives of that island could be tolerated.

Information was received in the month of June of this year from the Government of India to the effect that the Al-bur-Ah tribe had the intention of forming a Settlement at Zibara, on the

115

Persian Gulf, with the support of the Turkish Mutessarif of Basra, who was further reported to

have been making a serious menace to the Turkish Pasha, whose

Further information has now been received to the effect that the Al-bur-Ah tribe settled at Zibara as Turkish subjects by order of the

on the proceedings their local officials do not receive Turkish authorities Bahrein, which is at the present time in a state of anarchy to protect the

No. 107.

Sir M. Durand to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 23.)

(No. 34.)

My Lord,

Washington, February 13, 1905.

I DULY forwarded to its destination the letter inclosed in your Lordship's despatch No. 24 of the 25th January, addressed by your Lordship to the Chief Justice of the United States, appointing him to act as Arbitrator in the forthcoming arbitration between His Majesty's Government and that of the French Republic in regard to Muscat.

Chief Justice Fuller has now sent me his reply with a request that I will transmit it to your Lordship, and I have the honour to inclose it herewith.

I have, &c.
(Signed) H. M. DURAND.

Inclosure in No. 107.

Chief Justice Fuller to the Marquess of Lansdowne.

Supreme Court of the United States,

Chief Justice's Chambers, February 13, 1905.

Sir,

I acknowledge the communication of the 25th January informing me of the appointment by His Britannic Majesty's Government to act on their behalf as Arbitrator in the arbitration between the Government of His Majesty and that of the French Republic to determine certain disputed questions relating to Muscat, which, as heretofore intimated, it gives me sincere pleasure to accept.

And also the inclosed copies of the Arbitral Agreement, signed by the two Governments the 13th October, 1904, and of the supplementary Agreement, signed the 25th January.

I have, &c.
(Signed) MELVILLE W. FULLER.

No. 108.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 23.)

(No. 42.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, February 23, 1905.

SOME anxiety is being caused to the Turkish Government by rumoured movements of troops and military stores in the nine canons connected with disturbed state of Yemen.

I should be glad of your Lordship's instructions for event of my being asked as to nature of precautionary measures being taken by Aden authorities.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 24.)

Sir,

India Office, February 22, 1905.

I AM directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to inclose, to be laid before the Marquess of Lansdowne, copy of a letter from the Government of India, on the subject of the position of the Political Agent at Kuwait.

As regards the steps to be taken for the temporary withdrawal of the Agent, which are discussed in the 7th paragraph of the letter, Mr. Brodrick will be glad to be informed whether Lord Lansdowne sees any objection to the views expressed by the Government of India.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY

Inclosure in No. 109

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick

(Secret)

Sir,

Fort William, January 19, 1905.

WE have received your Secret despatch dated the 11th November, 1904, on the subject of the posting of a Political Agent at Kuwait, and in reply we have the honour to submit the following observations in explanation of the attitude which the Government of India have adopted in the matter.

2. On the 31st July, 1903, the Government of India, in reply to an inquiry from your predecessor, expressed an opinion in favour of the appointment of an Agent; but, in view of objections raised by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, it was ultimately decided to continue the then existing practice of deputing an officer to Kuwait from time to time from the Residency at Bushra.

3. In the early part of 1904, a new situation having arisen, in consequence of the armed intervention of the Turkish authorities in the struggle being carried on in Central Arabia between Ibn Rashid and Ibn Saud, the question of posting a British officer at Kuwait was again raised and on the 24th June you sanctioned the appointment of an Agent in a telegram, in which no words were used which could be held to imply that the appointment was only temporary. On the 28th July, 1904, you ordered Captain Knox to proceed at once to Kuwait "in such a manner that unnecessary attention may not be attracted," and this telegram again contained nothing that could lead us to suppose that the appointment was not to be a permanent one.

4. In accordance with these instructions, Captain Knox proceeded to Kuwait at the beginning of August, and in a letter dated the 7th September, 1904, he was duly enjoined to act so as not to attract unnecessary attention, but nothing was said to him as to the temporary nature of his appointment. Since then he appears to have confined himself exclusively to the functions which he was authorized by His Majesty's Government to exercise, but no doubt he has done or said nothing that would convey

5. Hence the arrangements in connection with the posting of the Political Agent at Kuwait were throughout made on the supposition that the appointment was of the character that we have described, and this policy appeared at the time to be agreed to by all parties. From the instructions conveyed to us, we do not see that any other inference was possible. More recently, however, the Turkish Ambassador has been informed that the appointment of a British officer to Kuwait is only temporary, and we are requested to take measures with a view to the withdrawal of Captain Knox for a time.

6. We have received this intimation with regret, since the present appears to us to be a time when it is thought to show a weakening of British interest or a surrender of British claims in any part of the Persian Gulf. You will perceive from the correspondence which accompanies this despatch that, though the Sheikh remains at present well affected towards the British connection, his attitude may, in the opinion of Major Cox, be altered, should existing conditions not be maintained in the future.

Owing, apparently, to the failure of Ibn Rashid to maintain his position in Central Arabia, and possibly to the bad treatment accorded by him to his Turkish auxiliaries, the Porte seems to be seriously considering the advisability of confirming

Ibn Saud in Nejd, on condition that he accepts Turkish supremacy. Major Cox, in his opinion, is of the opinion that, if the Porte were to do this, it would be a great advantage to us, when terms are arranged, employ Saud to seduce Mubarak from his allegiance to us. Major Cox adds—

As long as we maintain the present arrangement, I do not think we have much to fear; but if simultaneously with 'rapprochement,' we go away or partially withdraw palpable support from Kuwait, then the ultimate probability must be the secession of Mubarak.

These considerations derive additional weight from a study of the present position in other parts of the Gulf.

The recent occurrences at Bahrein show that the Ruler of that island by no means realizes the attitude which is due from him to his British protector; and even if the measures which have been suggested to induce him to listen to the representations of the Political Resident are accepted by His Majesty's Government and prove successful, the impression likely to result therefrom in the Persian Gulf generally may be neutralised by any appearance of diminution in the degree of support extended by us to the Sheikh of Kuwait, who already suffers for his British connection at the hands of Turkish officials in the matter of his estates at Fao and its neighbourhood.

to obey the instructions

with the exigencies of the local situation, so as to avoid either exciting the suspicion

7. The proposal which at present commends itself to us is that Captain Knox, of a suitable residence for himself, he does not see his way to spending the trying months of the hot weather at Kuwait, and that he has, for reasons of health, applied for, and received, permission to leave temporarily. On the understanding that he is to render it safe to do so. A report on this scheme is expected from Major Cox, who has also been asked whether any other ground of temporary withdrawal would, in his opinion, be preferable; and until his reply has been received, it is difficult for us to decide finally in the matter. But whatever plan is ultimately adopted, His Majesty's Government will at once be informed, and it may be assumed that the withdrawal will take place about the date to which reference has been made above.

8. In regard to the observations contained in paragraph 3 of your letter, and of to Major Cox in regard to Nejd affairs were not intended to encourage the dispatch of any officer to Riyadh or to any other place in the interior of Arabia, but merely to secure as much early and accurate information in regard to Nejd affairs as could, without the display of undue interest, be obtained by Captain Knox without leaving Kuwait. Throughout his stay to avoid indiscretion in the collection of information. Moreover, a copy of your despatch dated the 29th April, 1904, has already been communicated to the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf. His special attention has, however, in addition been drawn to the directions contained therein, as well as in your telegram, and he has been instructed to take an opportunity of repeating to Sheikh Mubarak the warning against entanglements in the interior of Arabia which was given him in November 1903 by His Excellency the Viceroy. We inclose copies of correspondence bearing on the points which are discussed in this despatch.

We have, &c.

(Signed)

CURZON

KITCHENER

E. R. ELLES

A. T. ARUNDEL

DENZIL IBBETSON

H. ERLE RICHARDS

J. P. HEWETT

E. N. BAKER

No. 110.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 24.)

(No. 43.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, February 24, 1905.

NEJD. With reference to my telegram No. 38 of the 17th instant, I have received the following telegram, No. 17 of the 23rd February, from His Majesty's Consul at Bassorah:—

"With reference to my telegram No. 16 of the 15th instant, I believe account of first meeting to be correct. I have corroboration, including a statement of the Vali to me, as to what passed between his Excellency and Ibn Saoud's father.

"In the second meeting I hear that Sheikh and Ibn Saoud asked for the Sultan's pardon of Ibn Saoud in writing.

"Vali sent letters to the Sheikh on the 14th instant and sent an urgent telegram demanding reply to them on the 20th.

"Vali is said to be in or near Kasim with troops."

No. 111.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir A. Hardinge.

(No. 17.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, February 26, 1905.

KOWEIT Arabs in Persia.

With reference to your telegram No. 16 of the 17th instant, you might inform the Persian Government that, although the Sheikh of Koweit has no doubt certain relations with the Sultan of Turkey, His Majesty's Government regard him as enjoying a large measure of practical independence, and that we have special arrangements with him under which we have undertaken to afford him our good offices.

It will be better not to inform them of the precise details of our arrangements, as they have not been communicated to the Porte or to the other Powers.

No. 112.

Acting Consul Monahan to Mr. Townley.—(Received at the Foreign Office, February 26.)

(No. 6.)

Sir,

Bassorah, February 4, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 2 of the 28th ultimo, transmitting copies of two despatches from me to the Resident at Bushire respecting the Fao grievances of Sheikh Mubarak, I have the honour to transmit herewith copy of a further despatch from me to the Resident at Bushire correcting the second despatch referred to, namely, the one relative to the "Sawls" (embankments or breakwaters) of Sheikh Mubarak at Fao.

I have, &c.

(Signed) J. H. MONAHAN.

Inclosure in No. 112.

Acting Consul Monahan to Resident at Bushire.

(No. 4.)

Sir,

Bassorah, February 3, 1905.

THE following correction should be made in my letter No. 3 of the 28th ultimo:—
For "the land between the fort and the sea has gained much, &c.," read "the land between Mubarak's property and the sea, or the river above and below the fort, &c."

I would also modify my statement in the same letter. "He (Mubarak) reasonably answers that this right of the Turkish Government is not enforced elsewhere in the Bassorah Vilayet." I find upon inquiry that the right, though often waived, is in fact often enforced.

I have, &c.

(Signed) J. H. MONAHAN.

149

No. 113.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 25.)

(No. 44.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, February 25, 1905.

YEMEN disturbances. My telegram No. 42 of the 23rd instant.

News received from Yemen continues to be bad. The rebels have captured Terim, and practically destroyed Kataba and Ab, and there is danger to the entire Caza of Taz. At Hijeh the troops have been massacred by the rebels, whilst in Sanan itself they are said to be dispirited and deserting. Transport of troops between Ma'an and Akabah is occasioning great difficulty.

No. 114.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Townley.

(No. 15.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, February 25, 1905.

NO military movements or preparations are, to our knowledge, being made at Aden, as suggested in your telegram No. 42 of the 23rd instant.

If you are questioned, however, you should say that His Majesty's Government must obviously reserve to themselves the right to take any measures they consider necessary to maintain their just claims, as the Turkish Government are still refusing to fulfil their promises in regard to the settlement of the frontier.

No. 115.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, February 25, 1905.

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to transmit herewith, for the confidential information of the Secretary of State for India in Council, copy of a Report,* dated the 11th of this month, from the Law Officers of the Crown upon the questions regarding the pearl fisheries in the Persian Gulf, which were discussed in your letter of the 30th June, 1904.

Lord Lansdowne would be glad to receive any observations which Mr. Brodrick may be good enough to offer on the matter after considering this Report.

I am, &c.

(Signed) E. GORST.

No. 116.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 27.)

(No. 123.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 20, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 87 of the 7th instant, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Damascus respecting the military expedition to the Yemen.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 116.

Consul Richards to Mr. Townley.

(No. 7.)

Sir,

Damascus, February 7, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 4 of the 24th ultimo, I have the honour to report that since that date two battalions of Redifs have arrived here from Yaffa via Beyrout, while another (also a Redif) battalion has arrived from Hamah. All three battalions have left Damascus for Ma'an.

On the 3rd instant General (Ferik) Ali Riza Pasha, the chief of the staff in Tripoli of Africa, who, as reported in the despatch under reference, has been appointed to the chief command of the Yemen expedition, arrived here from Beyrout. It is not known yet what the General's movements will be.

I should state that a Nizam battalion which was stationed in the Hauran has also left for Ma'an, so that at present there are three battalions of Redifs and one of Nizams now at that place.

In the meantime, a considerable amount of angry discontent has been caused here by the requisitioning of pack animals for the use of the troops, ninety horses and 150 camels having been "commandeered" by the authorities from various civilian residents of Damascus, who are not likely to see their animals again. I understand that the camels will only be employed for transport between Ma'an and Akaba, while it is intended to take the horses the whole way to the Yemen. I hear that, owing to the fact that the contractors have not been paid what is due to them for some time past, they have refused to supply the troops any longer with meat, so that the unfortunate men have been totally deprived of that most necessary article of diet for the last three weeks. Considering that the cold has been most unusually severe here during that same period, the deprivation must have been most acutely felt.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. S. RICHARDS.

No. 117.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 27.)

(No. 124.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 21, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith a despatch from His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad reporting on movements of troops at Nejed.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

Inclosure in No. 117.

Consul-General Newmarch to Mr. Townley.

(No. 7.)

Sir,

Bagdad, January 23, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to submit, for your information, the following extract from my diary to the Government of India of to-day's date:—

"The Vice-Consul at Karbala, in a letter dated the 13th January, 1905, reports as follows:—

"In continuation of my report No. 9, dated the 7th January, 1905, I beg to say that on the 10th instant ammunition, &c., with 200 camels came here, and on the 12th the labour of about 500 soldiers that was waiting for the ammunition started for Nejed. On the 11th instant two other detachments of about 350 soldiers, under the command of Bimbashi (Major) Amin Yamin Effendi, arrived here. They too had 60 camels with them. The strength of Amin Yamin's labour is said to be 1,100, out of which 350 have arrived and the rest have started from Muntafik. Up to this time about 1,000 camels have gone from Karbala to Nejed.

"It is said that the Mushir has encouraged the soldiers by promising that they would not have to march more than three hours every day, and that he would provide one camel for every three soldiers.

"When the Redif of Karbala reached Diwania, there was, it is said, an altercation between the soldiers and an Arab tribe called Al Shabans, in which one soldier was killed and two wounded. The soldiers wanted to retaliate, but their rifles were rusted and would not work.

"Three days ago a tabour of 900 soldiers with 250 camels has gone from Hindiya to Nejed."

I have, &c.
(Signed) L. S. NEWMARCH, Major,
Political Resident in Turkish Arabia, and His Britannic
Majesty's Consul-General, Bagdad.

No. 118.

Mr. Townley to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 27.)

(No. 127.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, February 21, 1905.

WITH reference to your Lordship's despatch No. 45 of the 14th instant, in which you instruct me that it is not necessary in press for the removal of the Kaimakam of Katala, I have the honour to report that I asked the Grand Vizier yesterday whether the report asked for from the Mutasarrif of Tanz had been received, and if so what action the Imperial Government had taken in the matter.

Ferid Pasha replied that, unfortunately, at the present moment other weighty matters were occupying the attention of the authorities in question. It was true, he said, that Arif Pasha had succeeded in reaching Sanad, but the road behind him had been blocked again by the rebels, and the Government had been without reliable information from the capital of the province for some time. It was known, his Highness added, that Arif Pasha had endeavoured to open a road to the coast by a southern route, but had failed to do so, and could not hope to make his way back to Hodeida through the 14,000 or 15,000 rebels that blocked the road. There was now a considerable force collected at Confouda and Hodeida, but there was no hope of their taking any effective action against the insurgents until some strong commander arrived to lead them. Such a man was Riza Pasha, who had been sent from Tripoli, in Africa, to take command of the troops in the Yemen; he had already reached Akaba, and was due at Confouda in a few days with reinforcements. Reports that have reached me seem to show that, while the Government troops have been able to maintain their position at Sanad, numerous posts in other parts of the vilayet have fallen into the hands of the insurgents.

I would beg to refer your Lordship to Lord Cromer's telegram No. 15 of the 19th instant, stating that a mutinous force of Turkish soldiers was on board the Greek steam-ship "Epirus" at Suez, and that the vessel could not proceed on its journey because the captain had not got the wherewithal to pay the Canal dues. Instructions to pay these dues were issued yesterday, but I would call your Lordship's attention to the fact that the vessel was not intended by the Turkish Government to convey troops through the Suez Canal.

She had been chartered to take troops from Confouda to Hodeida, but on going on board the men mutinied, seized and bound the officers, and forced the captain to take them to Suez. This most unfortunate incident throws a lurid light upon the temper of the troops now being assembled at Confouda and Hodeida for the pacification of the Yemen, and it is to be feared that Riza Pasha has an arduous task before him, unless the necessary funds to pay the men the arrears due to them are speedily found. In the present instance the Turkish Government have accepted the inevitable, and rather than betray their weakness have paid the Canal dues for the "Epirus," and have issued orders that the troops are to be landed at Mersina and sent to their homes, where they will be dealt with as may seem right. The stores and munitions, should there be any left, are to be returned forthwith to Hodeida on the same ship.

It is given out by the Porte that the mutineers are time-expired men returning home, a story that is not easy of credence when it is known that all available troops are being hurried to the Yemen with the utmost dispatch.

I am sending a copy of this despatch to Lord Cromer.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WALTER TOWNLEY.

No. 119.

Sir H. Howard to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 28.)

(No. 30.)

My Lord,

The Hague, February 27, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 15 of the 2nd instant, I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a letter just received from M. de Ruyssenaers communicating a letter of yesterday's date from M. Savornin Lohman, stating that, as he and the Honourable Melville Fuller, the two Arbitrators in the Muscat Arbitration, have not been able to agree upon an Umpire within the month's delay fixed for that purpose by Article 1 of the Anglo-French Agreement of the 13th October, 1904, the choice of the said Umpire must now be intrusted to His Majesty the King of Italy.

It will be seen that M. Savornin Lohman is of opinion that the said month's delay for the selection of an Umpire commenced on the 26th January last, the date of the letter of the French Minister for Foreign Affairs appointing him as Arbitrator, and consequently expired at midnight on the 25th instant.

I have, &c.

(Signed) HENRY HOWARD.

Inclosure 1 in No. 119.

M. de Ruyssenaers to Sir H. Howard.

M. le Ministre,

La Haye, le 27 Février, 1905.

J'AI l'honneur de porter à la connaissance de votre Excellence que je viens de recevoir de M. le Jonkheer de Savornin Lohman une lettre, datée du 26 courant, constatant que les deux Arbitres nommés par les Gouvernements Anglais et Français dans l'arbitrage des bœufiers de Mascate ne sont pas tombés d'accord sur le choix du Surarbitre, qu'ils avaient à élire dans le délai d'un mois à partir de leur propre nomination.

En transmettant ci-joint à votre Excellence copie de la communication susmentionnée, je suis, &c.

(Signé) L. H. RUYSSENAERS.

Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire,
Secrétaire-Général de la Cour Permanente d'Arbitrage.

Inclosure 2 in No. 119.

M. Lohman to M. de Ruyssenaers.

M. le Secrétaire-Général,

La Haye, le 26 Février, 1905.

D'APRÈS l'Article 1^{er} du Compromis Arbitral concernant le différend entre la France et la Grande-Bretagne, les deux Arbitres nommés par les Hautes Parties Contractantes choisiront ensemble un Surarbitre. Si, dans le délai d'un mois à partir de la nomination, ils ne pourront tomber d'accord, le choix d'un Surarbitre sera confié à Sa Majesté le Roi d'Italie.

Ces deux Arbitres, nommés par la France et la Grande-Bretagne, n'ont pu tomber d'accord sur le choix du Surarbitre.

Comme la nomination des Arbitres me semble datée du 26 Janvier—la lettre du Ministre des Affaires Étrangères de la République, me priant d'agir en qualité d'Arbitre, porte la date du 26 Janvier, et m'est parvenue le 28 Janvier—le délai fixé par l'Article 1^{er} susdit est expiré, de sorte que le choix du Surarbitre devra être confié à Sa Majesté le Roi d'Italie.

En vous priant, M. le Secrétaire-Général, de vouloir porter ce fait à la connaissance des Hautes Parties Contractantes, j'ai, &c.

(Signé) A. F. DE SAVORNIN LOHMAN.

No. 120.

Sir H. Howard to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received February 28.)

(No. 31. Confidential.)

My Lord,

The Hague, February 27, 1905.

WITH reference to my immediately preceding despatch No. 30 of to-day's date, I have the honour to report that I learn confidentially from M. de Ruyssenaers that, with his intervention, M. Savornin Lohman has been in correspondence by post and telegraph to the following effect with Mr. Justice Fuller as to the selection of an Umpire in the Muscat Arbitration since or immediately after the 1st instant, when the appointment of Mr. Fuller was notified to the International Bureau, viz.:—

In the first instance M. Lohman sent Mr. Fuller the names of the following three members of the Court from which to select an Umpire—viz., M. Charles Lardy, of Switzerland; M. Beernaert, of Belgium; and Professor Asser, of the Netherlands.

Mr. Fuller replied that in view of the mention of the King of Italy in Article 1 of the Agreement, he would, out of compliment to His Majesty, propose Count Nigra as Umpire.

To this M. Lohman agreed, and M. Ruyssenaers informed Count Nigra of his selection by the Arbitrators, but his Excellency answered that owing to ill-health, which confined him to his room, he could not accept the appointment.

This refusal was notified to Mr. Fuller, and the names of Messrs. Lardy, Beernaert, and Asser were again submitted to him.

Mr. Fuller replied that he would prefer M. Graen, of Sweden, as a knowledge of English was of vital importance.

On the receipt of this telegram M. Lohman answered, likewise by telegraph, that as M. Graen was the President of the Tribunal in the pending Japanese House-Tax Arbitration, he did not think it would do to select him as Umpire in the Muscat Case, and again submitted the names of Messrs. Lardy, Beernaert, and Asser, and added that the month's delay for selecting an Umpire according to the Agreement would expire on the 25th instant.

To this telegram neither M. Lohman nor M. Ruyssenaers have received any reply, and it was for this reason that the former addressed his letter of yesterday's date to M. Ruyssenaers, of which I have transmitted a copy in my above-named despatch.

I have, &c.

(Signed) HENRY HOWARD.

No. 121.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received February 28.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 27th February, relative to accusations brought by Turkish authorities against British officers in the Persian Gulf.

India Office, February 28, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 121.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

February 27, 1905.

KOWEIT. Please refer to my telegram of the 9th instant. Political Resident in Persian Gulf telegraphs as follows, in reply to telegram which we addressed to him on the 29th ultimo:—

"Your No. 400 E.B.

"I have made inquiry of the officers concerned, and am now in a position to reply categorically to your queries:—

"1. Officers have abandoned journey to El Hassa, and they never contemplated visit to Nejd or Central Arabia.

[1516]

"2. They abandoned their visit to Nejef, and have now left Turkish Arabia finally.

"3. The five vessels referred to by the Turks must be the boats of the R.I.M.S. 'Investigator.'

"4. As regards 'British functionary,' to whom the Turks refer, either Knox or Gabriel, who visited Umkarr, must be meant. Officers were, however, careful not to hold any communication with the tribes, and there is absolutely no truth in the allegations as to incitement of tribes.

"5. British flag has never on any occasion been hoisted by Sheikh of Koweit. It is possible that temporary survey flag was mistaken for the British flag.

"Some protest on our part seems to be called for in view of these sensational and baseless reports of the Turks."

We submit that the time has now come for representation to be made at Constantinople, protesting against the readiness with which baseless accusations constantly brought against our officers in Persian Gulf by local Turkish authorities are accepted without examination by the Turkish Government.